651. Also, petition of Maude M. Gibson and others, Orlo Vista, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

652. Also, petition of A. P. Marshall and others, Orlo Vista, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

653. Also, petition of Mary E. Stackhouse and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

654. Also, petition of Miss Mary I. Lee and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136; known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, we beseech Thee to be present and favorable unto these, Thy servants, granting them grace and wisdom to meet the tasks of this day with a pure and steadfast devotion.

Fill us with a greater desire to incarnate the spirit of the Master in whose character and conduct we find the clear and commanding revelation of our duty toward Thee and our fellow men.

Inspire us to give ourselves faithfully and resolutely to the high adventure of building a nobler civilization. Show us how we may mobilize the great moral and spiritual forces in promoting friendship and understanding among the nations of the earth.

We bring our petitions in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 25, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Chavez	Ferguson
Bricker	Connally	Flanders
Bridges	Donnell	Fulbright
Butler	Douglas	George
Byrd	Eastland	Gillette
Cain	Ecton	Green
Chapman	Ellender	Gurney
Hayden	Long	Schoeppel
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Hill	McClellan	Sparkman
Hoey	McFarland	Stennis
Holland	McGrath	Taft
Humphrey	McKellar	Taylor
Hunt	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Ives	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	Thye
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Tobey
Kem	Myers	Tydings
Kerr	Neely	Vandenberg
Kilgore	O'Conor	Wherry
Knowland	Pepper	Wiley
Langer	Robertson	Williams
Lodge	Saltonstall	Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is attending a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is attending a meeting of the appropriations subcommittee on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained at a meeting of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and insert matters in the RECORD, without speeches and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WATKINS was excused from attending the session of the Senate today.

Mr. FREAR asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, by direction of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I ask unanimous consent that the committee be allowed to sit this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF FLATHEAD NATION OF INDIANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 452), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on the tort claims paid by that Agency and its constituent agencies, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration, for the calendar year 1948, under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OFFICES TO ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer the office of the Probation Officer of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the office of the Register of Wills of the District of Columbia, and the Commission on Mental Health, from the Government of the District of Columbia to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, for budgetary and administrative purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUDIT REPORT OF CORPORATIONS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS GROUP

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Corporations of the Inter-American Affairs Group, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 26

"Concurrent resolution protesting the action of Gen. Lucius D. Clay in commuting the sentence of Ilse Koch and requesting the proper authorities in Washington to have the matter reviewed in order that the ends of justice may be served

"Whereas voices of protest in strong indignation are being heard against the impending release of Ilse Koch of Buchenwald from imprisonment and against the action of Gen. Lucius D. Clay in commuting her life sentence to a 4-year term of imprisonment; and

"Whereas the revolting atrocities of which Ilse Koch is accused have shocked the civilized world: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature protest the action of Gen. Lucius D. Clay in commuting the life sentence of Ilse Koch to a 4-year term of imprisonment, and request the proper authorities in Washington to have the matter reviewed in order that the ends of justice may be well served; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Harry S. Truman, to the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, to Gen. Omar Bradley, and to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress, with the urgent request that action be taken in memory of those World War citizens of the United States who made the supreme sacrifice on the battlefields in defense of their country and in prison camps.

"Adopted by the senate, April 13, 1949.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, April 14, 1949."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Resolution 23

"Whereas the National Guard of the United States and of the several States has performed outstanding service to both State and Nation in defending this country in two great wars, providing leadership and initiative and displaying courage, resourcefulness, and integrity reflecting great credit upon these individuals and their organizations; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that: 'The Congress shall have power * * * to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by the Congress'; and

"Whereas the Bill of Rights in the second amendment provides: 'A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed'; and

"Whereas the framers of the Constitution contemplated a standing Army as the only Federal military force as proven by the arguments advanced by Hamilton (see Federalists Papers, 24-28, inclusive) whereby he persuaded the States to accept the principle of a standing army, large enough to accommodate the immediate proposal of Congress only, its size to be controlled by limited appropriations for a period of 2 years only, and he also persuaded the States to agree not to keep troops in time of peace without the consent of Congress in exchange for the provision that Congress should have power to provide for the organizing, arming, and training the militia with the States reserving the power to appoint officers and the authority for training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; and

"Whereas the Committee on Civilian Components, appointed by the Secretary of Defense on or about November 7, 1947, commonly referred to as the Gray Board, in its report submitted on or about June 30, 1948, which report was not released to the press until August 16, 1948, recommended that all services each have one Federal reserve force, that the National Guard and Organized Reserves should be incorporated into the Army Reserve under the name of the National Guard of the United States; and

"Whereas this action, if successful, would result in complete dismemberment of the National Guard of the United States and of the several States, destroying an organization consisting of over 320,000 men contained in 27 infantry divisions, 520 air units, and other tactical units; and

"Whereas this action would rob the United States of an adequate national defense at a time when this country's foreign policy demands maximum military strength; and

"Whereas this action would be in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States and would foist fantastic costs upon the Nation and the several States, requiring immediate expenditure of billions of dollars for housing and training facilities for the Federal force and impose a tremendous financial burden upon each State in maintaining its own militia for local security needs, in addition to providing cutthroat competition among all the services for available personnel to man these forces: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the members of this Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Missouri condemn, without reserve, the report of the Committee on Civilian Components recommending the establishment of a single Federal Reserve or Militia, as unconstitutional, un-American, and contrary to our concept and philosophy of life and Government and, furthermore, that their proposals are ill-advised, illegal, and if put into effect, would destroy the National Guard, which, by the committee's own admission, had rendered outstanding service and performed with effectiveness and efficiency in two World Wars and since its reorganization in less than 2 years had completed amazing strides in building an M-day force; be it further

"Resolved, That the members of this assembly call upon the Congress and the President of the United States to resist this effort to centralize the military power in Washington; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the Congress, to the President of the United States, and the Secretaries of Defense, Army, Navy, and Air, and the members of the Committee on Civilian Components."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memoralizing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal income-tax law

"Whereas the present Federal income-tax law is so drawn that in the event a taxpayer pays more income taxes than necessary for him to pay, the overpayment is refunded to the taxpayer, plus interest thereon at 6 percent per annum; and

"Whereas, as a result of this provision of the income-tax law, many taxpayers take advantage thereof by overpaying the amount of their taxes in order to procure interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum during the time such overpayment is in the hands of the Government; and

"Whereas, this practice is resulting in an undue and unjust burden upon the Federal Treasury: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Minnesota memoralize the Congress of the United States to amend the income-tax law so as to provide that an interest rate of 2 percent be paid on the amount of income tax overpaid by a taxpayer during the period such overpayment is in the hands of the Government; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Approved April 15, 1949.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

"Concurrent resolution memoralizing the President and Congress of the United States to repeal section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to excise taxes on furs, and to amend House Roll No. 1211 to provide suitable import quotas on furs to protect the domestic producer

"Whereas the fur-farming business in the United States is in critical condition due to abolishing of import quotas on foreign furs by Executive order of the President of the United States; and

"Whereas the 20-percent luxury tax now imposed by Congress on domestic furs is prohibitive, and has seriously curtailed the consumer demand for furs in the United States; and

"Whereas existing legislation enacted by the Congress intended to subsidize fur farming has failed in its purpose in that the requirements for loans to fur farmers by the Federal Government are such that almost all of those engaged in the fur-farming business within the United States have been unable to meet the requirements to secure a loan; and

"Whereas fur farmers throughout the Nation have investments of millions of dollars in animals and equipment and Minnesota is particularly affected in that it is the second largest fur-producing State in the Union: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the senate concurring herein), as follows: (1) That the President of the United States is hereby memoralized to vacate his Executive order abolishing import quotas on foreign furs; (2) that the Congress of the United States is hereby memoralized to repeal section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to excise taxes on furs; and (3) that Congress amend House Roll No. 1211 now pending to provide import quotas on furs to protect the domestic producer, and that the foregoing action be taken by the President and Congress of the United States during the present session of Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be directed to forward a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and

House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Approved April 14, 1949.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"To Whom It May Concern:

"This is to certify that the following resolution was adopted by the Senate of the State of California on April 11, 1949:

" 'Senate Resolution 83

" 'Whereas under the provisions of the Lea Act the Congress of the United States has authorized appropriations to match funds contributed by the State of California for the development of waterfowl feeding and management grounds to relieve depredations to farm crops; and

" 'Whereas the wildlife conservation board on March 19, 1949, made available to the California Fish and Game Commission a total of $2,380,000 for the purpose of developing five key units in the system of projects being jointly planned and developed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Fish and Game Commission to accomplish the foregoing objectives; and

" 'Whereas this cooperative program is of such vast importance to the production of food as well as to the management of the waterfowl resources of the continent that it deserves to be pushed to completion as rapidly as possible: Now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved by the senate,* That the Senate of the State of California respectfully memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate the full $250,000 recommended by the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and that thereafter a minimum of at least $250,000 be provided annually in the appropriations to the Department of the Interior until the current conditions have been corrected; and be it further

" '*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States.' "

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"House Resolution 161

"Resolution relative to memorializing the Senate of the United States to curb the practice of filibustering in order to prevent the undermining of democratic processes and the neglect of State needs

"Whereas the present Senate rules have led to an abuse of free speech by those who have engaged in long speeches known as filibusters for the sole purpose of blocking action on vital legislation; and

"Whereas this practice is an antiparliamentary device which nullifies democratic processes and violates the principle of majority rule and is a procedure unknown to the Constitution; and

"Whereas this device has been used from time to time to block the passage of legislation desired by an overwhelming majority of people and has on occasion resulted in endangering national security; and

"Whereas there are at present the guaranties of free speech and adequate debate in that every bill is fully discussed in committee and on the floor of both Houses of Congress; and even after cloture is invoked each of the 96 Senators is allowed an additional hour of debate which ordinarily would consume 4 to 6 weeks of debate; and

"Whereas the filibuster has become a serious national problem and a matter of vital concern to the respective States of the Union and important to relationships and legislation affecting their interests: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the assembly respectfully memorializes the Senate of the United States to change its rules in order to prevent this practice of filibustering by allowing cloture to be invoked by a simple majority of the elected Members; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and to each Senator from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Memorial 5

"To the Office of Chief of Engineers, to the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the community of Nenana, Alaska, has periodically suffered severe flood damage from seasonal overflowing of the Tanana and Nenana Rivers; and

"Whereas this damage has consisted not only of the carrying away and injury of personal and public property but also of the polluting of the domestic water supply of the town of Nenana with consequent threat and injury to the health and life of the inhabitants; and

"Whereas the periodical floods at Nenana have threatened on occasions to render impossible operation of the Alaska Railroad, which is the main transportation artery for the interior of Alaska, including the major defense installations there:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that the Corps of Engineers immediately institute studies and flood control works designed to prevent damage from high waters in the town and vicinity of Nenana, Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Memorial 15

"To the Congress of the United States, the United States Public Health Service, and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in nineteenth session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the people of Alaska are desirous of bringing the Territory to a high state of development and the health of our people is of prime importance in the development of the Territory; and

"Whereas the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate to Congress from Alaska, has introduced an amendment to the Federal Hospital Survey and Construction Act to provide $250,000 in place of $100,000 per year now authorized to construct hospitals in the Territory in order to provide the best possible care for Alaskan citizens; and

"Whereas Alaskan communities must depend on Federal subsidy to assist them in constructing community facilities:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that the Congress favorably consider the amendment to the Federal Hospital Survey and Construction Act introduced by Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate to Congress from Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Memorial 4

"To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the United States Forest Service, the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Public Roads Administration, and to the Delegate From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the Public Roads Administration has two sections of road known as the Tongass Highway leading to Ketchikan, the southern section being 8 miles long and the northern section being 16 miles long, which said two sections terminate at the city limits of Ketchikan and are linked only by a single, inadequate, and unsafe thoroughfare through Ketchikan, said thoroughfare consisting of 15,000 linear feet of wooden trestle or narrow paved fills; and

"Whereas, this single thoroughfare is of temporary construction, requiring maintenance costs of $50,000 per annum, has numerous bottlenecks of less than 20 feet in width and has many temporary sections which, within a short time, must be replaced in their entirety; and

"Whereas, existing governmental agencies, including the United States Coast Guard, Alaska Communications System, and the United States Forest Service, have facilities located along the north and south Tongass Highways, and personnel and vehicular equipment of these agencies must use the above-described connecting link in traveling between their rural stations and their city offices; and

"Whereas some 2,000 persons presently reside in approximately 550 homes along the north and south Tongass Highways, and require a reliable means of transportation to the city center; and

"Whereas industrial demands at present tax this inadequate link of the highway system, and the advent of Ketchikan's suburban area of the largest new industry in southeastern Alaska, namely, the $30,000,000 pulp and paper mill to be located 6 miles north of Ketchikan on the north Tongass Highway, will double the traffic on Ketchikan streets and will make the above described thoroughfare totally inadequate; and

"Whereas the advent of the pulp industry will bring increased homes to Ketchikan, all of which require fire protection and necessitates the need for a permanent thoroughfare for rapid transit of personnel and equipment; and

"Whereas the only feasible routing, because of topographical features, is over difficult terrain along a rocky shoreline, requiring for permanent construction considerable portions of concrete trestlework, fills and retaining walls, with construction costs tentatively estimated at $2,000,000; and

"Whereas the Organic Act limits taxation and bonded indebtedness to a point so low as to place this project entirely beyond the means of the city of Ketchikan:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, prays that the Congress of the United States appropriate special funds to assist the city of Ketchikan to accomplish this vitally needed project.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"Senate Joint Memorial 27

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress From Alaska, and the General Manager of the Alaska Railroad:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas considerations of national defense and of strengthening the economy of the Territory of Alaska require that the federally owned Alaska Railroad be placed in condition for efficient operation; and

"Whereas substantial progress toward this goal has been made by the present General Manager of the Alaska Railroad and his associates under the so-called Alaska Railroad rehabilitation program; and

"Whereas the sum of $38,000,000 has been requested from the Federal Government to carry into effect so much of the program as is feasible in the 1950 fiscal year, such request now being considered by the Congress:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully requests that the General Manager of the Alaska Railroad, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Alaska, the Congress of the United States, and all others who have had a part in drawing up and effectuating the Alaska Railroad rehabilitation program should be, and the same are hereby, complimented and thanked for their efforts on behalf of the people of Alaska.

"Your memorialist further prays that the Congress make available the requested $38,000,000 for carrying on the rehabilitation work on this federally owned and operated railroad throughout fiscal 1950.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 26

"To the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska is desirous of implementing its democratic process so that the laws of the Territory may reflect more closely and truly the will of the people thereof; and

"Whereas it is the tradition and policy of the United States of America to grant more self-government to its Territories so that they too may enjoy the blessings of individual and collective liberty and self-determination; and

"Whereas the initiative and referendum and recall have been a tested and proven means whereby, in many States, these blessings have been secured to the people; and

"Whereas it has been well settled in the courts that the initiative and referendum and recall are constitutional and are in harmony with the republican form of government:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will give the people of Alaska the powers of initiative and referendum and recall.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"Senate Joint Memorial 18

"To the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the United States Army Engineers, and the Delegate From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas many of the residents of the town of Haines, Alaska, depend upon fishing for a livelihood, and use a sizable fleet of small fishing boats in carrying out their occupational activities; and

"Whereas there are no harbor facilities for small boats at Haines and during the winter months said boats are at the mercy of the northern winds which often wreak destructive havoc upon the unprotected fishing fleet; and

"Whereas there is plenty of native material available near Haines for the purpose of constructing a seawall which would provide adequate protection for the Haines fishing fleet; and

"Whereas the town of Haines is without funds sufficient to build said seawall for the construction of a small boat harbor for Haines:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist prays that the proper departments of the Government take prompt and necessary steps to bring about construction of the harbor facilities as above indicated, as soon as possible.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 32

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate amendments of title 28 of the United States Code, entitled 'Judicial Code and Judiciary' to take effect upon the admission of Hawaii to statehood

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact amendments of title 28 of the United States Code, entitled 'Judicial Code and Judiciary,' to take effect upon the admission of Hawaii to statehood, as provided by H. R. 3780 introduced on March 24, 1947, or in such other form as may be appropriate; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby particularly requested, in enacting such legislation, (1) to protect and preserve as credit applicable to the retirement and disability benefits provided by said title 28, years of judicial service in the courts mentioned in section 373 of said title 28, as provided in said H. R. 3780 or in such other form as may be appropriate, and (2) to specifically provide, by amendment of said H. R. 3780 or in such other manner as may be appropriate, that in no event shall such amendments of title 28 effect any decrease in the rights of any judge who had relinquished his office prior to the admission of Hawaii to statehood or whose office as established by the Hawaiian Organic Act is terminated by the admission of Hawaii to statehood, based upon his years of service, age and salary, and the law in effect as of the date when his office was so relinquished or terminated; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution upon its adoption shall be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 35

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact a bill numbered S. 566, and entitled "a bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii," now before the Senate of the Congress of the United States of America, providing an increase in the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the present Federal compensation allowed to supreme court justices and circuit court judges of the Territory of Hawaii is grossly inadequate; and

"Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the Congress of the United States of America has reported favorably upon and recommended the passage of a bill numbered S. 566 and entitled "a bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii," which bill, if enacted, would increase the Federal compensation of supreme court justices and circuit court judges of the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact said S. 566 entitled 'a bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii,' as reported and recommended by the Committee on Judiciary of the Senate of the Congress of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Attorney General of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to price support for eggs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GILLETTE on April 22, 1949, p. 4905, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relating to the establishment of a veterans' employment and national economic development corporation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLIKIN on April 25, 1949, p. 4953, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relating to a liquid fuel plant or plants for the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLIKIN on April 25, 1949, p. 4952, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relating to assistance for veterans in the settlement of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLIKIN on April 25, 1949, p. 4953, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relating to appropriations for carrying out an interim survey report for the Arkansas River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on April 21, 1949, p. 4833, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the eviction of veterans and their families from Devencrest in the town of Ayer, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See text of resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) on April 22, 1949, p. 4906, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to compensation for employees of the Division of Employment Security of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See text of resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. LODGE (for himself

and Mr. SALTONSTALL) on April 22, 1949, p. 4906, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Honolulu (T. H.) Council of Social Agencies, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the control and eradication of the oriental fruitfly in Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the North Carolina Employees Association, of Raleigh, N. C., signed by Mason E. Swearingen, president, praying for the enactment of the deficiency appropriation bill providing funds for the Bureau of Employment Security; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Methodist Federation for Social Action, of New York, N. Y., signed by Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary, relating to a cut in the national military budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Pennsylvania Realtors Association, of Harrisburg, Pa., signed by Charles E. Horner, chairman, legislative committee, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing public housing and slum clearance to be paid for by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Partisan Republicans of California, in meeting assembled at Los Angeles, Calif., relating to an investigation of communism in the State Department; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Tennessee State Junior Chamber of Commerce, relating to a federal union of Atlantic democracies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Unico National, at Chicago, Ill., relating to Government use of certain properties confiscated from the Germans in 1917 in Hoboken, N. J.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Ansonia, Conn.; the St. Mary's Lyceum, Inc., of Bondsville; and the SS. Peter and Paul School alumni, of Three Rivers, both in the State of Massachusetts; the Town Council of the Borough of Ambridge, Pa.; the City Council of the City of Mesa, Ariz.; and the Common Council of the City of Marinette, Wis., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the executive council, Missouri State Dental Association; the Little Rock (Ark.) Association of Insurance Women; and the Kentucky State Dental Association, of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF OMAHA (NEBR.) BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Omaha Bar Association, Omaha, Nebr., on April 21, 1949, relative to the proposed national health program.

This resolution endorses a program to provide the necessities of good health, including medical care, administered at local levels, but protests against any system of compulsory sickness insurance designed for national bureaucratic control.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRODUCTION OF POTTERY AT VEGA BAJA, P. R.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter from local union No. 6, Chinaware, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, of Wheeling, W. Va., signed by George W. Friedrich, secretary, relating to the production of pottery at Vega Baja, P. R., and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL UNION NO. 6, CHINAWARE,
NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
OPERATIVE POTTERS,
Wheeling, W. Va., April 5, 1949.

The Honorable JOHN W. BRICKER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inasmuch as 60 percent of our members are residents of the State of Ohio, I have been instructed by our local union to write you regarding a pottery which is soon to start production at Vega Baja, P. R. We understand they will be able to produce 15,000 dozen pieces of ware a week. The workers who produce this ware will receive about 30 cents per hour, which is about 25 percent of our common labor rate in American potteries, and 15 percent of our average skilled labor rate.

We understand this plant is being opened by the Crane China Corp. at Syracuse, N. Y., which, we understand, is also the Iroquois China Co. of New York. I am sure you can readily see what it would mean to the American potteries to have this amount of ware dumped on their market at 50 percent less than our prices. We wish to urge you to take whatever steps you possibly can to safeguard our job opportunities.

Trusting you will give this matter your most earnest consideration,

Yours very truly,
GEORGE W. FRIEDRICH,
Secretary.

SAXON PEOPLE OF TRANSYLVANIA, RUMANIA — COMMUNICATION FROM WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR AMERICANISM, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a communication from the Women's League for Americanism, Cleveland, Ohio, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR AMERICANISM,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 7, 1949.

To the Congress of the United States:

ARE WE CHRISTIANS OR CRIMINALS?

The desperate cry for justice of a despondent and vanishing people, the Saxon people of Transylvania, Rumania, is reaching our country. The fate and future of these most unfortunate people are resting in the powerful hands of our Congress.

This urgent appeal for help may be answered in a Christian way or it may be criminally ignored by the Congress of the United States.

The Saxon people, like many other Christian people of Europe, are the victims of the treaties signed at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

The air from Transylvania and the far steppes of Russia to the Capital of the United States is filled with cries of agony from broken souls of Morgenthau's enslaved human beings.

If the Saxon people who are without protection are to survive as a link in the great chain of Christian civilization, their homeland must be restored. Their schools, churches, hospitals, municipalities, and private property which has been confiscated must be returned: Their family members must be freed from communstic slavery, torture, and misery.

We believe that it is the sacred duty of Congress to act in behalf of the Saxon people without further delay. If Congress should ignore this call at this late hour, our hearts will be filled with sadness because this experience would lead us to believe that our beautiful America has lost the Providence in its course of destiny.

Very truly yours,
MRS. ANNA WOLF,
President.
MRS. RENATE TIMM,
Secretary.

CONSERVATION OF WASTE PAPER—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF MANITOWOC, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from Arthur Post, city clerk of Manitowoc, Wis., an important resolution adopted by the mayor and common council of that city. The resolution pertains to the conservation of waste paper, a subject to which we gave much attention during the war years, but which now, unfortunately, we tend to forget.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas for many years there has been a shortage of lumber so vitally needed for so many purposes, one of the biggest items being for the making of paper; and

Whereas during the war all of the people in the United States were requested and urged to save newspapers and magazines and other materials made of paper, which were gathered up and used again to make paper, thus conserving the lumber supply in the United States, which is gradually getting less and less; and

Whereas the people of the United States are no longer asked to save paper material, and the price of old paper has gone down so much that it does not even pay for the junkman to gather the same; and

Whereas we all realize that this tremendous waste of paper should not be permitted to continue, because eventually our people and country will suffer as a result of this tremendous waste: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Manitowoc, That we urge upon our representatives at Washington to give this matter their careful consideration, with a view of adopting legislation by the Congress of the United States providing ways and means to save paper, thus conserving our greatly needed lumber supplies in this country.

Adopted April 18, 1949.

W. C. RANDOLPH.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN PERSONS—RESOLUTION OF ROSS E. FRENCH POST, NO. 2328, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, WILLISTON, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolu-

tion adopted by Ross E. French Post, No. 2328, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Williston, N. Dak., relating to un-American activities of certain persons, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has come to our attention that certain individuals who profess to be American citizens who have openly indicated that if the United States should become involved in war with a certain foreign power that their allegiance would be with such foreign power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ross E. French Post, No. 2328, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Williston, N. Dak., at a regular meeting held Tuesday, April 5, 1949, by unanimous vote, recommend that action be taken immediately to curb such un-American activities of such persons and that immediate legislation be enacted to prevent further impositions against the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Department headquarters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG and to Representatives USHER L. BURDICK and WILLIAM LEMKE.

Dated at Williston, N. Dak., this 8th day of April 1949.

ROBT. WINJE,
Post Commander.

RESOLUTIONS OF ASSOCIATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, MILNOR, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference three resolutions adopted by the Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, of Milnor, N. Dak., relating to rural telephone service, shortage of electric power, and the development of the Missouri Valley, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"RESOLUTION NO. 1 ADOPTED BY THE ASSOCIATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, OF MILNOR, N. DAK.

"Whereas rural telephone service is not available to the major portion of our farm population, and whereas such service is an essential service needed by all farmers; Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we heartily endorse and support legislation now pending before Congress to amend the National REA Act to provide for expansion of rural telephone service."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"RESOLUTION NO. 3 ADOPTED BY ASSOCIATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, MILNOR, N. DAK.

"Whereas there now exists in our State a severe shortage of electrical power, and of transmission lines to distribute power to the many various REA substations and whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has definite plans for construction of such transmission lines at some time in the future: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we respectfully request Congress to immediately appropriate adequate funds and give authorization and direction to the Bureau of Reclamation to enable them to construct at once these aforementioned transmission lines."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTION NO. 4 ADOPTED BY ASSOCIATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, OF MILNOR, N. DAK.

"Whereas a coordinated development of the Missouri Valley is essential to the welfare of all our people and whereas S. 1160 creating a Missouri Valley Authority has been introduced in Congress by Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON YOUNG and 14 other Senators: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we heartily endorse S. 1160; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we highly commend our distinguished Senators MILTON YOUNG and WILLIAM LANGER for their support and sponsorship of said S. 1160."

COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON STATE GRANGES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present a letter from Morton Tompkins, master of the Oregon State grange, Portland, Oreg., transmitting resolutions adopted by the McMinnville Grange, No. 31, the Lincoln Grange, No. 395, of Lincoln County; the Goldson Grange, No. 868, of Lane County; the Maine River Grange, No. 550, of Lane County; and the Bridge Grange, No. 730, Coos County; all in the State of Oregon, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter, together with the resolutions, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE GRANGE,
Portland, Oreg., April 11, 1949.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed are copies of original resolutions favoring the principles of a Columbia Valley Authority which are similar in character to those which I sent you under date of April 7. The original of all of these resolutions have been sent directly to the President.

Sincerely,

MORTON TOMPKINS,
Master.

Whereas the development of the Columbia River watershed both for power and for irrigation is too great an undertaking for State or political subdivision; and

Whereas the development of this great waterway is necessary to complete the economic fulfillment of the Northwest; and

Whereas there are too many problems developing this great natural resource to permit its being entrusted to the service departments of Government or to the States adjacent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor a Columbia Valley Authority which shall be charged with the development and administration of the herein mentioned activities; be it further

Resolved, That in establishing this Authority the Congress be enjoined to convey to the several States adjacent to the Columbia River as much of the administration of the Columbia Valley Authority as is feasible.

McMINNVILLE GRANGE, No. 31,
LAWRENCE E. SCHREIBER, *Master.*
MABLE TOLIVIER, *Secretary.*

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to the Eighty-first Congress the establishment of a Columbia River Authority taking into account the characteristics and needs of the regions, and the interests of all parts of the executive branch; and

Whereas the people of the State of Oregon are fully aware of the advantages to be gained by the establishment of a Columbia River Authority as an aid to industrial development, national defense, flood control and land and forest conservation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Lincoln Grange, No. 395, request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia River Authority to coordinate the full development of the water and other resources of the Columbia Valley.

Adopted, March 1949.

LINCOLN GRANGE, No. 395,
LINCOLN COUNTY, OREG.,
PAUL F. KEADY, *Master,*
MARY A. ZEEK, *Secretary.*

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Goldson Grange of Oregon feel that the Columbia Valley Authority program would help our community and others by providing better flood control and more power, plus many other advantages. Since there is no unified program for the reclaiming and conservation of range lands here, full development of the resources of the Columbia Valley cannot be fulfilled with the existing bureaus with no regional and local control.

We resolve that the Congress of the United States should enact legislation for the establishment of a CVA to coordinate the full development of the water and other resources of the Columbia Valley, including such benefits as flood control, navigation, irrigation, industrial and domestic water supply, and electric power.

Adopted by Goldson Grange No. 868 at a regular meeting of its members this 2d day of March 1949.

WILLARD M. POWELL,
Master.
YVONNE HANSEN,
Secretary.

(Goldson Grange, No. 868, Lane County; number of members, 48.)

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the rapid population increase of the Pacific Northwest makes a complexity of increasing problems more acute, among which are need for measures to conserve forests, range lands, and fish life; to provide for measures to conserve forests, range lands, and fish life; to provide development of phosphate production for increased agricultural productivity; to increase acreage of productive land through irrigation and drainage projects and to institute a program of flood control which becomes more urgent yearly; and

Whereas an effective solution to these and other interrelated problems demands coordinated effort on a scale more comprehensive than that of local or even State activity, and

Whereas the need of such coordination of activity on a regional basis has been recognized by the President in his recommendation to the Eighty-first Congress that a Columbia Valley Authority be established: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That national legislation be enacted for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate and direct development of the water and other resources to the end that the optimum benefits, including electric power, accrue to our growing population presently and in the future.

Adopted by Main River Grange No. 550 at a regular meeting of its members March 5, 1949.

ELLA WAYTE,
Secretary.
HARRY LINDBLOQM,
Master.
JAMES A. CADDELL,
W. E. WAITE,
RALPH PETERSON,
Executive Committee.

(Main River Grange No. 550, Lane County; number of members, 72.)

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to the Eighty-first Congress the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority; and

Whereas Coos County has a very definite power shortage; and

Whereas Coos County has vast possibilities in the development of industries now held back because of said power shortage; and

Whereas Coos County, being a county of such varied interests as dairying, farming, fishing, logging, and mills, is very anxious for a unified program covering all different interests fairly, and

Whereas such a unified program of full development of the resources of the Columbia Valley to benefit all equally as much as possible cannot be worked out with conflicting bureaus: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate the full development of the water and other resources of the Columbia Valley.

Adopted by Bridge Grange No. 730 on this 12th day of March 1949.

BLANCHE L. DAVIS,
Secretary.
POWELL LANCASTER,
Master.
CHARLES G. MACK,
MARION E. BROWN,
T. J. DAVIS,
Executive Committee.

(Bridge Grange, No. 730, Coos County; number of members, 60.)

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3762. A bill to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," and title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 303).

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF STATE DEPARTMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original bill to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and I submit a report—No. 304—thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1704) to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1695. A bill to permit the sending of Braille writers to or from the blind at the same rates as provided for their transportation for repair purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. LONG also introduced Senate bill 1696, to prohibit the use of 1-cent postal cards for transmission of commercial advertising or business solicitation, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1697. A bill to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina introduced Senate bill 1698, to amend section 302 (c) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1699. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1700, to establish a Federal Waterlands Reserve and to provide for aid to the public schools with a portion of the receipts therefrom, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1701. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Marcus; and

S. 1702. A bill for the relief of Riyoko Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1703. A bill to provide that unclaimed animals lawfully impounded in the District of Columbia be made available to educational, scientific, and governmental institutions licensed under this act, shall be made available for scientific purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original bill (S. 1704) to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1705, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF CERTAIN POSTAL CARDS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the use of 1-cent postal cards for certain purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement of the purpose of the bill prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the explanatory statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1696) to prohibit the use of 1-cent postal cards for transmission of commercial advertising or business solicitation, introduced by Mr. LONG, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no postal card or private mailing or post card shall be accepted for delivery or delivered through the mails at the 1-cent rate if such card is being transmitted for purposes of commercial advertising or business solicitation. This act shall not be applicable to any such card deposited or caused to be deposited, for mailing or delivery, by any organization which is exempt from taxation under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code, or to any such card mailed for local delivery at a post office where free delivery by carrier is not established and such card is not collected or delivered by a rural or star-route carrier.

The statement presented by Mr. LONG is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

The 1-cent postal card is losing the Federal Government approximately $57,000,000 a year. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee is considering legislation to increase the 1-cent postal card from 1 cent to 2 cents, or possibly more. We are told by the postal authorities that less than 10 percent of the 1-cent postal cards are used by poor people and private individuals for whose benefit this card was designed. Instead, more than 90 percent of the 1-cent postal cards are being used by large business organizations for commercial advertisements and business solicitations.

Personally I prefer to see the 1-cent postal card continued for the use of the ordinary individual for whom it was intended, and for that reason I am introducing a bill making it unlawful to use the 1-cent postal card for commercial or business purposes. This proposal eliminates charitable, religious, agricultural, labor, and nonprofit organizations from its provisions, in order that worthy undertakings, toward which the Federal Government has seen fit to extend tax exemption, may continue to receive the benefit of this cheap postal service. By the passage of this bill we will be able to retain the penny postal card, which has become an American institution, at a small cost to our postal service.

AMENDMENT OF ARMY AND AIR FORCE VITALIZATION AND RETIREMENT EQUALIZATION ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 302 (c) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1698) to amend section 302 (c) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The traditional American policy for national security depends upon a large and trained Reserve to supplement the Regular services in time of war or national emergency.

One of the outstanding pieces of legislation to create and maintain a vigorous Reserve was the enactment of Public Law 810 by the Eightieth Congress.

Under the provisions of this law, a reservist may earn a modest retirement after 20 years of satisfactory service and having reached the age of 60.

Public Law 810—Eightieth Congress—providing for longevity retirement for Reserve and National Guard personnel was enacted June 29, 1948.

Unfortunately, the effective date of this act on which the reservist must begin earning retirement credits should have been more carefully specified.

The present situation is that credits on the basis of 50 per year must be earned for each retirement year beginning June 29, 1948, even though by the statute itself, the services did not have to publish the regulations for earning those credits until the end of 1948.

Only now are the bulk of the Reserve and National Guard personnel learning the details of those regulations and the services themselves were unable to set up the administration for carrying out the provisions of the law until early in 1949.

These administrative delays, due to the fault of no one has made it difficult, if not impossible, for the great majority of the reservists to fulfill the requirements for the current year ending June 29, 1949.

My bill would correct this situation and would establish July 1, 1949, instead of June 29, 1948, as the date upon which the reservist would be required to begin to earn their point credits to qualify for retirement under Public Law 810.

This bill will clarify the confused situation and correct the delay which inevitably marked the start of this new system.

AID TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Federal Waterlands Reserve. This bill provides for turning the tidelands oil over to the schools of the United States.

The bill (S. 1700) to establish a Federal Waterlands Reserve and to provide for aid to the public schools with a portion of the receipts therefrom, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 138 (legislative budget) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is suspended pending further study and until otherwise provided by concurrent resolution or law.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF ALASKA RAILROAD AND CANAL ZONE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1359) to repeal the provisions of the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and sections 91 to 107 of the Canal Zone Code and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such provisions are applicable, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ETC.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3333, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 260)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the views of the minority of the Committee on the District of Columbia on the bill (H. R. 3704) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, which were ordered to be printed.

REVIEW OF REPORT ON INTEROCEANIC CANAL ACROSS NICARAGUA—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, upon its introduction on April 2, Senate bill 1489, authorizing a review of the report on the interoceanic canal across Nicaragua contained in House Document 139, Seventy-second Congress, first session, was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Armed Services. I have consulted the Parliamentarian, and he advised me that this bill should properly be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I therefore ask that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCORPORATION OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.—RECOMMITTAL OF S. 1418

On motion of Mr. MCGRATH, and by unanimous consent, the bill (S. 1418) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes," was taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it our intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 44, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 502. (a) The Secretary of Labor, with respect to appropriations made in title I of this act, and the Federal Security Administrator, with respect to appropriations made in title II of this act, are authorized and directed, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to make such reductions in the amounts to be expended from the appropriations made in each such title as will in the aggregate equal at least 5 percent of the total amounts so appropriated therein (less in the case of title II amounts appropriated for grants under titles I, IV, parts 1, 2, and 3 of V and X of the Social Security Act, and grants to the States for unemployment compensation and employment-services administration), except that appropriations for grants under title I, IV, parts 1, 2, and 3 of V and X of the Social Security Act, and grants to the States for unemployment compensation and employment-services administration shall not be reduced. The Secretary of Labor and the Federal Security Administrator shall certify the reduction in each appropriation account to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives. The amounts so certified shall not be expended but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

"(b) Such reduction shall be made in a manner calculated to bring about the greatest economy in expenditure consistent with the efficiency of the service.

"(c) No item of appropriation contained in either of such titles shall be reduced more than 20 percent.

"(d) A statement of each reduction hereunder, including the amount thereof, shall be included in the annual budget for the fiscal year 1951."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG AT ANNUAL AWARD DINNER OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him at the annual award dinner of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, New York City, on April 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHARITY TRUSTS—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Curb the Charity Trust Racket," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW TWIST IN THE COMMUNIST LINE—BROADCAST BY JACK BEALL

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a broadcast by Jack Beall, of the American Broadcasting Co., relative to a new twist in the Communist line, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KRAVCHENKO TRIAL IN PARIS—ARTICLE FROM CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Courtroom Victory in Paris for Kravchenko Was Russian Defeat," published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROBERT N. DENHAM, GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLES BY CHARLES H. HOUSTON

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from three articles by Charles H. Houston, relative to the National Labor Relations Board and Robert H. Denham which appear in the Appendix.]

ROBERT N. DENHAM, GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—ARTICLE BY MARJORIE McKENZIE

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Pursuit of Democracy," by Marjorie McKenzie, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO EDUCATION—LETTER BY DR. EDGAR FULLER

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relative to Federal aid to education, by Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the National Council of Chief State School Officers, published in the New York Times of April 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, the first entitled "Socialized Medicine," and the second "Socialized Medicine II," published in The Dalles Chronicle, respectively, of April 7, 1949, and April 8, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

LOUIS JOHNSON—ARTICLE BY MARQUIS CHILDS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Is Johnson Running for President?" written by Marquis Childs and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISMANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FISCAL POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM THE BEND (OREG.) BULLETIN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Avert the Danger," published in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of April 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the tenth of a series of articles published in the Baltimore Sun on what the American public would pay, and what it would receive, if Congress approves President Truman's social welfare program, which it is estimated, over a 50-year period will cost $1,250,000,000,000.

Today's article is entitled "Two Billion Dollars Yearly for Disability Pay."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—TWO BILLION DOLLARS YEARLY FOR DISABILITY PAY

(This is the tenth of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—On any given day nearly 4,000,000 men and women of working age in the United States are suffering from some disability which makes it impossible for them to work.

President Truman in January said to Congress that these people must not be left to the mercy of charity.

He urged then that they be partially insured against loss of income due to illness.

He has now asked Congress in an official administration bill to insure workers against two sorts of disabilities:

1. Temporary disability, that is, incapacities enduring for more than 7 days but not more than 26 weeks.

2. Permanent, or extended, disabilities which last more than 6 months.

The bill before Congress would provide:

1. For employees covered by old-age insurance (except Federal and military employees) temporary disability benefits ranging from $8 to $30 a week for single persons and up to $45 a week for married persons with three or more dependents.

2. For all employees and the self-employed suffering permanent disabilities, benefits to be the same as those for old-age and survivor insurance.

Benefits for the short periods of disability would be based upon previous wages and number of dependents.

The maximum of $45 a week could be claimed only by a worker earning more than $64 a week, the bill states.

Benefits for the permanent disabilities would depend upon the amount of the insured person's previous wages, his length of time in the insurance system, and the number of dependents.

NOT RELATED TO HEALTH BILL

These benefits would have no relation to the proposed compulsory health insurance, on which a bill was sent to Congress today.

The basic idea of disability insurance, Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Commissioner, told Congress, is to prevent families from suffering total loss of income through the illness or incapacity of the breadwinner.

"While it exists," Altmeyer said to the Ways and Means Committee recently, "disability may be economically more disastrous for a worker and his family than unemployment, death, or forced retirement."

Temporary disability-insurance benefits, the Commissioner estimated, will cost from the start about $1,000,000,000 a year.

He estimated that they will require contributions amounting to 1 percent of pay roll equally divided between worker and employer.

The pending bill proposes to add that amount to the weekly pay-roll tax on January 1, 1950.

The bill also proposes that the old-age and survivor tax, now 1 percent each for the employer and employee, shall go to 1½ percent for each on July 1.

That, together with the one-half percent for each to cover disabilities, would make a 2-percent pay-roll tax effective the first of next year.

In addition, the administration will ask for an extra one-fourth percent each from employer and employee to finance the start of compulsory health insurance.

Health insurance has quite a different purpose from disability insurance. Its purpose is to insure families against medical, dental, and hospital expenses.

About one-half of the persons disabled on a given day—about 2,000,000 in all—have been laid up for 6 months or more either from chronic illness or accident.

In figures given the Ways and Means Committee, costs of permanent disability ranged from a low of $430,000,000 a year to a high of $1,961,000,000 by the year 2000.

They are expected to run a little less than $1,000,000,000 a year until about 1960.

Social-security authorities estimate that the annual economic losses resulting from temporary disabilities range from $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000.

At present the only governmental cash sickness benefits are those provided under the Railroad Retirement and Insurance Act and by three States—Rhode Island, California, and New Jersey.

TO AID IN REHABILITATION

Not only does the bill propose to give partial insurance against loss of income to the disabled, but it also promises rehabilitation and return to work, if possible.

For working women, maternity benefits would be provided for a period of 8 weeks.

Temporary disability benefits would be payable after 1 week if the disabled worker "cannot engage in his usual, most recent, or reasonably similar work."

But the test for permanent disability would be that the worker "is found incapable of engaging in any substantially gainful work."

Benefits would, of course, be terminated if recovery occurred and the worker could return to work.

The bill says that beneficiaries under permanent disability would have to "undergo periodic examinations to determine whether disability still exists."

The doctor's fees for such examinations—called in the bill "redeterminations at necessary intervals"—would be paid out of the disability fund.

So would any "necessary travel expenses" to obtain such an examination.

If in the judgment of the administrator persons disabled for an extended period could be rehabilitated and restored to permanent work, the legislation would authorize and direct him to undertake it.

The bill reads:

"The Congress hereby finds and declares that rehabilitation of disabled individuals who are or may become entitled to extended disability benefits serves at least three very desirable purposes—

"It promotes the welfare of the individual.

"It conserves the assets of the national social insurance trust fund.

"It increases the potential economic products of the Nation."

It goes on then to say that "to the greatest extent practicable" the administrator shall undertake to rehabilitate all such persons and return them "to the labor market."

The existing vocational rehabilitation act would be made the basis for restoring disabled persons to the labor force.

And the pending bill states that the administrator may "cut off" a disabled person's benefits "if he refuses to co-operate" in getting rehabilitated.

If he refuses to be examined, he may also be cut off.

And, also, he may be denied benefits if he leaves the United States.

COST NOT ESTIMATED

There is no estimate available as to the probable future costs of rehabilitations under the disability program.

The 1950 budget carries an item of $23,000,000 for vocational rehabilitation next year.

Some disabilities, of course, can be traced to work-connected origins—that is, caused by the nature of the work—and are thus covered under workmen's compensation.

But an advisory council study last year found that less than 5 percent of permanent disabilities could be traced to such origins.

More than half of the cases of protracted disabilities occur at younger ages when workers have heavy family responsibilities, the studies indicated.

Because many such disabled workers may have young children, the benefits would be keyed not only to wages earned while working and length of employment but also to the number of a disabled worker's dependents.

Under the pending bill an aged disabled husband or widower, who is the dependent of a woman worker, would be given the same sort of protection as dependents of a male worker.

INSURANCE COMPANY VIEWS

Mr. Altmeyer told Congress the administration plans to use the same administrative machinery for short-term and extended disability, and to use the existing old-age insurance bureau's facilities.

Employers would only have to keep one set of wage records, he said, and prepare only one wage report covering old-age, survivors, and disability insurance.

In the present hearings before the Ways and Means Committee the life insurance companies of the United States raised what they called "grave doubts" about the feasibility of setting up a permanent disability system.

"The insurance companies," they told Congress, "have had an impressive adverse experience with total and permanent disability benefits."

But on that point Mr. Altmeyer cited a view expressed last year by the Senate Advisory Council on Social Security, which said that the experience of the life insurance companies was important but not conclusive.

As to the administration of temporary disability benefits, widely different views have been laid before the House committee.

"The administration of temporary disability benefits," the insurance companies told the committee, "would require a new and huge Nation-wide Federal bureaucracy of doubtful efficiency.

The social security commissioner said it would require very little addition to the administrative machinery.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR PETERSON, OF NEBRASKA, BEFORE THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB AND EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech delivered in New York on April 23 by the Honorable Val Peterson, Governor of Nebraska, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and immediately following his speech that an editorial appearing in the April 25 issue of the New York Herald Tribune also be printed. This speech contains some statements relating to the development of the Missouri River Basin which will be of interest to the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the address and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY GOV. VAL PETERSON, OF NEBRASKA, BEFORE THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 23, 1949

My pleasure in coming to New York does not result solely from the hospitality which I have received, gracious though that hospitality has been. It arises primarily from the opportunity afforded me to discuss with you some of the perplexing problems which confront the American people and the Republican Party. We believe in advancing the welfare of all sections of our country and all classes of our people, and we give our loyalty to the Republican Party only because we believe it to be the most effective instrument available for the achievement of that high purpose.

Some of my friends in Nebraska suggested that it was fortunate that I could address your group in an off year when the tensions and bitterness which mark our presidential elections are absent. Today we can temper our partisanship with a touch of objectivity, and can afford the luxury of seeing ourselves as do others. I know that you join with me in the wish that more light and discernment and less heat and bombast might be evident in our party councils and activities at all times.

It is encouraging to observe that since November last, the Republican Party has been doing some intensive soul-searching. Virtually every party leader has offered a diagnosis of our ills and prescribed a cure. In addition we have been told by writers, columnists, lecturers, and commentators, both friendly and otherwise, just why we have lost the last five presidential elections, and what we must do if we expect to win another.

There are those who also tell us that we aren't going to win no matter what we do and that we are through. My response, from Republican Nebraska, to this defeatist palaver is to recall Mark Twain and state that the report of our demise is greatly exaggerated.

A few months ago, the Republican National Committee met in our State in the city of Omaha. It was my privilege to address this gathering. Since then I have received about a thousand letters from people, big and small, about the country, who seemed genuinely interested in what I had to say.

The Chicago Daily Tribune was anything but flattering about my comments. In fact it made a lengthy editorial tirade upon one of my views. According to the renowned Colonel's paper, Roosevelt, and not the Japanese, bombed Pearl Harbor, and your fair city of New York is a hostile foreign country. We can all be happy, indeed, that his narrow nationalistic views have had limited acceptance. Be that as it may, the general response I received convinced me that many people of the rank and file, to which I belong, want of our party, the Republican party, an organization which is alive, breathes fresh air, and enjoys a healthy circulation.

Our principal difficulty arises from a lack of agreement as to what is wrong and what we ought to do about it. For example, on one hand we are told that the Republican Party has been reactionary in domestic and isolationist in foreign affairs when both the national interest and public opinion required the opposite policies. We must, therefore, out-promise the Democrats and out-new deal the New Deal.

On the other hand it is alleged that the Republican Party has not had the courage to stand by its guns and defend the economic and political principles of our fathers. We should return to the isolationism and reactionary economic doctrines of yesteryear.

Needless to say, I do not subscribe to either of these extreme points of view. My own approach to these problems is one which I like to think is, if you please, a cautious, though progressive, liberalism, or an enlightened conservatism. This, I take it, is what the Greek philosophers meant by the Golden Mean, or "all things in reason and nothing to excess."

I reject both the "me too" and "do nothing" positions. I want a Republican Party that will face today's problems forthrightly and take intellingent, effective action. I find nothing but discouragement in the attitude of those who would rather do nothing and be nothing than acknowledge any virtue, however slight, in the opposition.

Certainly we will get nowhere by demanding that Government withdraw from every activity into which it has entered in the last generation. The clock cannot be turned back, and we must recognize that we do not live in a frontier society in which government can confine itself to validating land titles and warding off the Indians.

Our party cannot be an agency of obstructionism, blind opposition and narrow personalism. It must be a party of the people, drawing its inspiration from the people. It must provide for the people the things which they want and which are in their best interest. If the desires of the people are not compatible with their long-range welfare, and that is, of course, the Nation's welfare, then it is the Republican party's duty and privilege to lead the people to an understanding of what is best.

I recognize a certain idealism in the suggestion made by Phillip Wilkie, which leads professional politicians and office holders to stamp it as impractical. Yet I am of the opinion that there is merit in his proposal that we hold a general Republican conference in which the rank and file of our party throughout the length and breadth of this land might meet to discuss, fully and frankly, the problems that face America and our position with respect to them.

I do not subscribe for one moment to the belief that the formation of the policies of our party should be the exclusive province of our congressional representatives, our State or local administrations, or the national committee. Certainly these groups have no corner upon the best thinking of America.

Our party must outline a set of fundamental principles upon which we can agree. Words and terms must be defined so that when we employ them we communicate thoughts which are understandable. We need, in fact, a party-wide course in elementary government. Take the expression, "me, too." In my judgment it would be ridiculous to apply it to a great Republican leader, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT.

In discussing the Republican Party in the current issue of Fortune magazine, he says: "We believe that Government has the obligation to promote better education, better health, better housing, better security for our people, and equality of opportunity." And he goes on to say that because of our tremendous productivity, "we can maintain a minimum floor under education, health, housing, and food."

Whenever you talk about floors or ceilings in an economic society, obviously you are talking about a society in which free enterprise is limited. Some will say this, and other proposals in Mr. TAFT's article, make him a "me, tooer." Certainly I can see no foundation for such a statement.

We need to know the meaning of free enterprise; to what degree it is possible in a modern society, whether it means the same thing to the small-business men and farmers of America and to the monopolists, who, while paying lip service, grow rich by doing everything to eliminate it. We need to understand that for over 50 years Republicans and Democrats alike have agreed upon the need to regulate big business and high finance in the interests of the little people who were unable to stand up against these modern giants. Further, both parties have utilized governmental undertakings to compel monopolies to reduce their rates and have extended Government enterprise into fields unoccupied by private enterprise. In short, Government has protected the weaker members of society by collective action.

What do we as Republicans believe is the function of government? Should it be limited strictly to maintaining law and order?

Some might answer "Yes." If so, would they be prepared to eliminate the public schools in America? Certainly that function could be performed by private enterprises. Yet that issue seemingly was settled approximately 100 years ago when it was a matter of bitter controversy. The same question might be asked about road, street, and bridge building, libraries, public health services, college education, the varied services supplied by our farmers and our businessmen, the subsidies to the air lines, the former subsidization of railroads, the postal system, rural free mail delivery, public recreation, and a multitude of other activities in which present-day governments engage.

We need to state honestly what functions of government we would be willing to fight to eliminate. We should outline those things which we have a reasonable hope to believe could be eliminated. To suggest such a course is to portray the enormous difficulty of our task.

No serious student of government, with whom I am familiar, would suggest that government need not regulate business in the interest of the general public, to protect the weak and unorganized against the strong and predatory. Such great Republicans as Charles Evans Hughes, Theodore Roosevelt, Elihu Root, and William Howard Taft accepted this as a proper responsibility of government. The new imperative in government, as Walter Lippmann calls it, was stated and implemented by a Republican President, Herbert Hoover. Did this action constitute a foundation for the undue development of statism in America, or was it a proper act by government to protect the public, our fellow citizens, friends, and neighbors against suffering and disaster?

President Hoover said during the difficult depression days, "The function of Federal Government in these times is to use its reserve powers and its strength for the protection of citizens and local governments by support to our institutions against forces beyond their control."

On the basis of that statement, he went forth to meet the depression with a program which competent students have said contained all the more specific principles of President Franklin Roosevelt's recovery program. Recognizing that he was departing radically from governmental precedent in not permitting the economic depression to run its course without interference, President Hoover stated, "We have not feared boldly to adopt unprecedented measures to meet the unprecedented violence of the storm."

Modern society no longer affords us the choice of a government that is neutral in matters economic. Modern life would be utterly impossible under such a situation. To propose it is to advocate anarchy. We can, and must, control the degree of governmental interference and direction which we will permit over our lives. To preserve individual initiative and enterprise we must check statism, the welfare state, the exponents of all-wise, all-powerful government, the womb-to-the-tomb "do-gooders." We must also check the monopolists and cartelists, business or labor, who are enemies of American free enterprise and competition as surely as are the inhabitants of the Kremlin.

In fact, when the people obtained the suffrage and free education, the foundation was laid for recognition that their lot could be improved by pressures through their government, directed at the Public Treasury. The people have the ultimate power in a democratic society. It is the responsibility of the leaders of our party to help lead the people to the wise use of that power so that choices beneficial to America are made. But if we aren't willing to have the people exercise their power, we admit lack of confidence in democracy and a willingness to see it destroyed.

I have lived in the Middle West all my life and am proud of the influence my Nebraska environment has had upon me. Above all, I have been taught the necessity and virtue of frugal living. I believe that this virtue is as applicable and necessary to State and National Government as it is to the individual. The trend under the New Deal has been toward bigger and more costly government—and it has been a trend which has gained momentum like the winter blitz we suffered in Nebraska only a few weeks ago.

Government this year will consume one out of every four dollars the individual earns. Actually this cost may increase in the near future as administration spending becomes greater, and particularly if the economic weather changes for the worse. For me the handwriting is on the wall. If we are honest with ourselves and meet our responsibilities to community, State, and Nation, we must pledge our party, the Republican Party, to fight relentlessly against present inflated government.

That's exactly what we are doing in Nebraska. In spite of the fact that for the fiscal year 1948, our per capita State taxes were the fifth lowest in America, the budget which I proposed to the Nebraska Legislature calls for an increase of only 5.7 percent in State expenditures for the coming biennium.

Economy, like charity, begins at home. I firmly believe that those of us who shoulder political responsibility must practice what we preach, because what we do as representatives of the party speaks louder than what we say.

Today the world faces squarely the necessity of immediate conservation and careful management of its natural resources in order to provide adequate subsistence for its inhabitants. The fact is that over half the people on the earth at this moment, and that's over a billion people, are suffering from chronic malnutrition and millions die of starvation annually. Part of this is due to inadequate transportation systems, but in the main it results from the ruination of great natural resources over wide portions of the world.

During the recent war, in company with thousands of other Americans, I served in the Orient, and the nature of my military duties was such as to take me over all of western China, India, Burma, the Middle East, and North Africa. In China, and in the other places mentioned, I saw widespread evidences of erosion which had destroyed what were formerly fertile areas upon which lived prosperous, happy people. Today in those areas live blighted populations whose lack of food is always revealed by the telltale bloated bellies of their little children. I have seen Chinese peasants trudging from the river bottom to high upon the sharply sloping, rocky hills, with a bucket of slime and muck slung from the ends of the yokes saddled upon their shoulders. Nothing was more valuable to them than the life-giving soil which they spread out upon their barren patches. Great sections of the earth have been ruined by men through overgrazing, careless handling of the soil, and destruction of forests. Men have lived as though the treasures of the world were inexhaustible, and even in this modern age we seem to assume that the magic of our scientists is such that we can disregard the warnings of nature as we blithely destroy her gifts, many of which if not beyond our power to re-create, at least cannot be restored, except at tremendous cost and over exceedingly long periods of time. Upon every continent, in every country, the effects of man's neglect and destructiveness are to be seen. We have been particularly profligate in the United States where we have been so richly endowed.

In the last few years, we have become aware of the necessity for conservation of the soil, our forests, and our water. Much has been accomplished, but in view of the stakes which are in the balance, what we have done to date is inadequate. We must expand our efforts until we apply upon every foot of our land the best soil management practices known. We must stop senseless destruction of our forests and put every drop of water to work producing for man.

In the Missouri Basin, we are presently engaged upon the greatest resource development undertaking of its kind in the history of the world. There is nothing comparable to it anywhere, except possibly the Russian development being carried on in the Volga River of which we know, of course, very little. In an area covering 530,000 square miles of territory and reaching from inside Canada to St. Louis, we are attempting to manage our soil in such a way as to contain in it the maximum amount of moisture which the Lord permits to fall upon it. Then, recognizing that there will be, in certain seasons, a tremendous run-off, we are building upon the main stem of the Missouri River and its tributaries 110 gigantic dams to impound behind them life-giving waters which can later be utilized for irrigation upon the parched soils of our western areas and to develop tremendous quantities of electric power as they are released. In addition, we are firming navigation upon the Missouri River, providing better municipal water supplies for our great river cities, and constructing exceedingly fine recreational areas. Briefly, instead of permitting the twin destructive forces of drought and flood to play dominant roles in our area, we intend to make the water which falls upon our soil work for our people from the time it descends in the form of raindrops and snow until it leaves our borders at St. Louis.

In one flood, in June 1947, we lost over $175,000,000 in property damages and in my State the lives of 13 people were taken. In 1935, 110 people lost their lives in a Nebraska flood. While the 1947 property damages were tremendous, they represent only a fraction of the value of the loss which the Missouri Basin sustained in the millions of tons of irreplaceable topsoil which were swept down the river to pile up in the deltas below New Orleans.

The work presently being done in the Missouri Basin is a fine example of constructive action by Government. The job is too big for the localities and States alone and requires the resources of all of the people of America applied through the National Government. The development of the basin, which contributes an important portion of the foodstuffs and raw materials of America, and is vital in many other respects, represents an investment in a more prosperous America. As a matter of fact, our Nation cannot afford not to develop this great area.

Construction in the area is presently going forward under the direction of a committee made up of representatives of the five great Federal agencies involved and the governors of five of the States. Governmental action is taken only after full and free democratically conducted inquiry, debate, and decision. The procedure represents democracy in action. Here is government at its best: government as the servant of the people, not as a master, not dictating, not ordering, not directing—but rather serving. Presently some enthusiasts of centralized governmental power are clamoring for the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority in the area. We do not want such an alien influence in our midst. We are resolved to fight against this evidence of bureaucracy. It can do nothing that is not already being accomplished efficiently and effectively. We know that those who believe that the voice of local citizens should be heard in government will rally to our support. Here is an issue of public welfare which transcends partisanship. But to the extent that partisanship

may be necessary, the Republican Party must stand for popular government against centralized controls.

The ever present thought of war looms just as disturbingly in the minds of the people of Nebraska as it does in yours. The plaintive hope for peace in our time hangs heavy over every city, town, and hamlet. In frequent tours of my State, whether it be to a remote cattle ranch in northwest Nebraska, or to an old people's home in one of our cities, I am asked the same question, Will there be another war?

If ever there was need for a unified foreign policy endowed with vision, wisdom, and clarity it is now. Unfortunately, such has not been the case. Since the last war the United States has spent millions of dollars in secret diplomacy and billions of dollars in direct economic concessions to European nations for the purpose of containing the Soviet Union. In spite of such acts of government, in spite of the organized hopes of millions of Americans, the Red bear in 1949 is perhaps stronger as a world power than ever before in history. It almost appears that the Soviet capacity for inciting world fear has grown in ratio to the increase of American expenditures to check such growth. After 3 years of the American containment program, the east-west deadlock continues and the cold war goes on.

There is no evidence that the United States has stopped the spread of Soviet influence in eastern and southern Asia. The Russians have increased pressure on the smaller nations of the Middle East, while in the past year and a half we vacillated hither and yon, losing prestige of all nations concerned on the Palestine question. By withdrawing in China we have yielded one-half of the world to Stalin after wildly tossing billions of dollars about in an attempt to stem the onslaught of his imperialism—a procedure which to me is as senseless as fighting to win a football game in the first half and then doing everything possible to lose it in the second. And the Russians have won the battle of Asiatic opinion through the west's fumbling efforts in Indonesia.

If American influence exceeds that of the hammer and sickle at all, it is only in the Western Hemisphere, at a few remote points in Asia, and what has been described as a deep beachhead in western Europe.

Russian imperialistic aggression, backed by the world's greatest military force, must, of course, be stopped. Further, the zealots, native and foreign, who seek relentlessly to undermine existing governments and replace them by Red ones, must be met head-on, and fire must be fought with fire. It is not enough to contain Russia. It is our job to meet her on every front and to point out clearly to the inhabitants of the areas in which we clash the many ways in which our democratic system is greatly superior.

I welcome the Marshall plan, I support the United Nations and approve the Atlantic Pact. I know, of course, however, by first-hand experience over much of the globe, that we live not in one world or in two worlds, but in many worlds. True, rapid transportation and communication make our world appear small and create a sense of oneness, but the important divisions are in men's minds, and we cannot have world federalism until we are able to eliminate, or at least soften greatly, the tremendous forces of ignorance, greed, religious, and racial prejudices, narrow nationalism, differing languages, political and economic ideologies which divide us. It is in the minds of men where one world must first be attained.

Despite the readiness of the American people to cooperate with the present administration in the tremendous expenditure of effort and material, our foreign policy has not been successful. The threat of war is perhaps as imminent today as since VJ-day.

The people of America are tired of the incessant bickering about the labels of international plans. We are committed to every peaceful endeavor for an effective world partnership of peace-loving nations. In the Atlantic Pact we have reflected American determination to sacrifice even peace, if need be, for the principles of freedom and self-determination for individuals and nations. We are dedicated to fight for our peace. Let us enter that fight with clean hands. Aggression must not have our support in any part of the globe. If we are to build friendship the world over, we must practice what we preach. We cannot stand as an inspiration to the people of other nations in the pursuit of a democratic way of life while lending tacit, if not outright, support to totalitarian governments. It matters little that such dictatorships currently may or may not be out of sympathy with the Soviets.

The Republican Party must make up its mind to stand up for a realistic foreign policy based on national survival. A realistic foreign policy would have found a way to save China. To be against reactionism in China certainly does not imply support to the Chinese Reds, any more than to fight the EAM forces in Greece implies that one is a Fascist. We Republicans must do what we can to prevent a repetition of the grevious China error. America cannot afford such bungling policies.

In 1854, Abraham Lincoln was debating with himself what political issues to discuss and defend. While so debating, he spoke the famous words, "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it." Nearly 100 years later, the Republican Party in this critical moment of its history asks itself the same question.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 25, 1949]

GOVERNOR OF NEBRASKA

Gov. Val Peterson, of Nebraska, made his voice heard through the Nation by a timely and powerful speech at the Omaha meeting of the Republican National Committee last January. New York has looked forward to a visit from him, and over the week end had the satisfaction of hearing him state his views on various problems. The Governor spoke with the forthrightness we expect from him native Midwest, in a tone which he himself described as "a cautious, though progressive liberalism * * * an enlightened conservatism." He struck the note which the Republican Party needs to hear, and which in its best seasons has come to it like a strengthening wind from across the continent.

Saturday, at a luncheon of the Women's National Republican Club, Governor Peterson announced that his party "certainly will get nowhere" by demanding that Government withdraw from every activity into which it has entered in the last generation. We must recognize, he said, "that we do not live in a frontier society in which Government can confine itself to validating land titles and warding off the Indians." Among the specific examples of the new functions which Government must undertake, the most interesting and the most novel to easterners was Governor Peterson's discussion of the immense resource conservation and development program now going forward in the Missouri Basin.

He described this work as the greatest of its kind in the history of the world, with nothing comparable to it anywhere "except possibly the Russian development being carried on in the Volga River." Over an area covering 530 square miles, land reclamation, flood control, and power development is being achieved through cooperation among five States and with the Federal Government. The Governor denied that a Missouri Valley Authority could accomplish anything not now being done. It is from this whole-hearted acceptance of the need for constructive action, combined with an insistence on methods more healthful than centralized authority and increased bureaucracy, that Governor Peterson's greatest contribution to his party and his Nation derives. We hope that we may be hearing more from him.

PROMOTION OF HEALTH OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1411) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in accordance with the understanding reached last night, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that an appropriation bill may be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3333, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer a brief statement as to the contents of the bill.

The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is $2,396,337,265, which is an increase over the House bill of $185,643,180.

Normal restorations of House reductions are recommended in the amount of $5,205,200, of which the largest amount was $3,200,000 for the strengthening of local health units.

Added to that, the committee felt duty-bound to go beyond the budget recommendations on the following programs which are vital to the welfare of the Nation:

Further development of vocational education	$9,458,980
Peptic ulcer research	50,000
National Cancer Institute	627,000
National Heart Institute	1,000,000
Dental research construction	2,000,000
Veterans Employment Service	450,000
Total	13,585,980

The largest increase is for payment of military service credits to the railroad-retirement account in the amount of $166,852,000. The committee recommended that the full commitment be made in the bill, but also recommended that the funds be made available in installments over 4 years, starting with a quarter of the total of $166,852,000 for the next fiscal year.

As a comparison with the increases recommended, the bill as reported to the Senate is $161,947,980 over the estimates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 11, after the word "public", to strike out "$1,074,000" and insert "$1,154,000".

ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES IN OPERATIONS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to page 4990 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday. As Senators are well aware, yesterday we were discussing the extension of certain powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation. During that debate, on Friday of last week, I invited the attention of the Senate to certain irregularities in the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation during the preelection period. It was rather noticeable that no Member of the Senate challenged those statements at that time. It was rather noticeable that during the 2-day interval from Friday to Monday, they were not challenged. I was discussing S. 900, the bill which was being debated, in which it was sought to give the Secretary complete power over the Commodity Credit Corporation. Recognizing the justification of my opposition to this provision, the Senate denied the Secretary of Agriculture control of that Corporation. However, just before the passage of the bill a statement was inserted in the RECORD for which evidently the chairman of the committee did not have too much respect, because for some reason he did not insert it in the RECORD earlier, and did not call it to the attention of the Senate during the debate. Evidently he must have felt that it would not have influenced the votes of Senators, although it was pertinent to the subject.

The Secretary saw fit to deny certain of the remarks which I made. I presume that had the chairman of the committee felt that those remarks were worthy of consideration, the statement of the Secretary's in reply to them would have been inserted in the RECORD earlier, or called to the attention of the Senate before the vote.

I should like to read a portion of the statement found on page 4990:

1. Senator WILLIAMS has accused the Department of misrepresenting facts when it stated last fall that CCC had operated at a profit.

A. He cited letters from the Budget Bureau setting forth the fact that the Corporation had lost over $2,100,000,000 from 1933 to December 31, 1948.

B. He also cited a Budget Bureau letter stating the $2,100,000,000 didn't include $1,700,000,000 of section 32 expenditures.

(1) Senator WILLIAMS then proceeded to add these two figures and claimed the CCC has shown a loss of almost $3,900,000,000.

C. He says the only way CCC can claim a profit is to count as income appropriations it has received or notes that have been canceled for it.

2. Senator WILLIAMS' charge and the basis on which he attempts to substantiate it are completely false.

A. He has twisted the facts to make it appear that the CCC has been a costly burden on the taxpayer, while, in fact, the Corporation has operated most economically considering the jobs it has had to do.

B. The Bureau of the Budget apparently either was misled by the manner in which the Senator presented his inquiry, did not know how to properly state the facts, or made no effort to do so.

Mr. President, I should like to repeat the last statement I have just read:

The Bureau of the Budget—

According to the Secretary of Agriculture, who is one of the members of the Cabinet, and is in charge of one of the administration's departments—

apparently either was misled by the manner in which the Senator presented his inquiry, did not know how to properly state the facts, or made no effort to do so.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be clear, I am going to review those letters and the inquiry which I made at that time.

On February 1, 1949, I wrote the following letter:

FEBRUARY 1, 1949.

MR. FRANK PACE, JR.,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PACE: Would you please furnish me at the earliest possible date the net results, from a taxpayer's standpoint, of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation since its inception in 1933 to the latest date you have available. I would like included in this report all moneys which have been expended by the Commodity Credit Corporation, including section 32 funds, minus the amount which has been returned to the Federal Treasury.

It is not necessary that this information be broken down in any manner, since the only answer I am interested in at this time is the net profit or loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation during its lifetime.

That letter was signed by me.

Mr. President, the only statement contained in that letter which I can conceive of, as being confusing to Secretary Brannan, is the statement made in the first sentence, which I shall read again:

Would you please furnish me at the earliest possible date the net results, from a taxpayer's standpoint, of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation—

Evidently Secretary Brannan has never heard of any request of a department to review its operations from a taxpayer's standpoint.

I read the reply to that letter, from F. J. Lawton, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget:

FEBRUARY 9, 1949.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In answer to your letter of February 1, 1949, the net loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation from its organization on October 17, 1933, through December 31, 1948, was $2,146,930,367.

He includes in the letter a breakdown of the losses, although I did not ask for that.

I now read another section of that letter:

Because corporate funds have been replenished by congressional appropriations, the records of the Corporation show a surplus of $52,544,719 on December 31, 1948.

In the letter he goes on to point out that nearly $4,000,000,000 has accrued to this Corporation through cancellation of notes or through appropriations. He said that because that was counted as income, the Corporation was able to show a $55,000,000 surplus.

In the same letter Mr. Lawton pointed out that the Commodity Credit Corporation had expended nearly $2,000,000,000 under section 32. I wished to be sure that the Bureau of the Budget was correct in that respect, so I wrote another letter to the Bureau of the Budget; here is the second letter to Mr. Frederick J. Lawton, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C.:

FEBRUARY 9, 1949.

DEAR MR. LAWTON: I received your letter of February 9, 1949, containing the information requested in my letter of February 1, 1949.

Am I correct in my understanding that the $2,146,930,367 designated as the loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation from the date of its organization through December 31, 1948, does not include the $1,743,960,803 mentioned in the second paragraph of your letter * * *?

Here is Mr. Lawton's reply to that letter, on February 16, 1949:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1949.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In confirmation of the telephone conversation with your office relating to your letter of February 9, you are correct in your understanding that the $2,146,930,367 designated as the loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation from the date of its organization through December 31, 1948, does not include the $1,743,960,803 mentioned in the second paragraph of our letter as expenditures under section 32.

Yours sincerely,

F. J. LAWTON,
Assistant Director.

If no one in the Department can understand that language, Mr. President, I think it is time that we put in the Department someone who can understand it.

At this time I should like to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who inserted those documents in the RECORD, and I would like to ask him what there is in those letters that is not plain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware requests unanimous consent that he may ask a question of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the question I should like to ask the Senator

from Oklahoma, after reading those letters, what is it that is not clear enough in my letters and what is his opinion of the statement in which the Secretary said:

> Senator WILLIAMS' charge and the basis on which he attempts to substantiate it are completely false.

The Secretary of Agriculture there was referring to the loss. Then he says:

> He has twisted the facts to make it appear that the CCC has been a costly burden on the taxpayer, while, in fact, the Corporation has operated most economically considering the job it has had to do.

Continuing—

> The Bureau of the Budget apparently either was misled by the manner in which the Senator presented his inquiry, did not know how to properly state the facts, or made no effort to do so.

At this point I should like to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, to have him comment on that statement.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. During the past several days and even weeks we have heard many charges made on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Delaware against the Commodity Credit Corporation and against the Department of Agriculture, and perhaps against others. After those charges were made, I requested the Secretary of Agriculture to read the charges in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then submit his answers. He complied with my request and submitted some answers. I placed those answers in the RECORD on yesterday.

I am not willing to participate in the debate between the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the Department of Agriculture. I do not have the facts, in the first instance; and I do not have time to develop the facts. So the information I placed in the RECORD, as stated, was the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma this question: Did I correctly understand from him that the statements are not his, but are the views of the Secretary of Agriculture, only?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. As stated in my request for the insertion of that material in the RECORD, they were developed at my request, but they were the statements of the Secretary of Agriculture, and, of course, not my own. I do not have the facts. I could not enter into the debate on this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The facts were in the RECORD. I am glad to have the Senator from Oklahoma clarify his position by stating that he himself was not supporting the position taken by the Secretary of Agriculture, and that the views expressed are those of the Secretary of Agriculture, only.

I should like to point out that the only rebuttal which has been made to any of the statements I have made regarding this agency, the Commodity Credit Corporation, has come from the Secretary of Agriculture alone. So far, I have not seen anyone submit any facts anywhere, in any record, which would deny anything I have said. The only resort the Secretary now has is his own statement that—

> The Bureau of the Budget apparently either was misled by the manner in which the Senator presented his inquiry, did not know how to properly state the facts, or made no effort to do so.

In other words, he says that when I asked the Bureau of the Budget to report on the question from a taxpayer's standpoint, the Bureau was not used to that kind of language, did not know how to reply to it, and gave an answer which was wrong.

Mr. President, I admit that probably I got an answer from the Bureau of the Budget different from any which I might have gotten from the Secretary of Agriculture, because I got the truth from the Bureau of the Budget, which is more than I have ever been able to get from the Secretary of Agriculture.

If the Secretary of Agriculture wished to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD anything bearing on the record of the financial operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I would glady insert it in the RECORD myself, if no other Senator wished to do so. If he can show from a taxpayer's standpoint where the Corporation made money, I wish he would do so, because the letter of the Bureau of the Budget which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Friday showed a detail of all the appropriations Congress has made, and the Bureau of the Budget subtracted from the total of those appropriations all the payments the Corporation has made back into the Treasury, and the net loss is shown to be nearly $4,000,000,000, over and above the net worth of the Corporation today.

Mr. President, it is obvious that any man who, as a Government official, says that Corporation has made money, simply is not capable of handling public money properly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been very much impressed by the amount of work the Senator from Delaware has done with regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have in mind a situation. I wonder whether the Senator has given it any thought or study, and what his reaction to the situation is. I refer to the Commodity Credit Corporation's handling of the situation insofar as rye is concerned. The Senator knows there is a support program for rye. I do not know how many rye farmers there are in Delaware. There are about 6,000 in my State, and it is of great concern to them. At this time the price our farmers are receiving for rye is about $1.06 as against the support price of $1.47. That means that if the Commodity Credit Corporation must take up all this rye, it will cost the taxpayers again millions upon millions of dollars.

As I understand—and I wish the Senator would follow this closely and tell me, if I am wrong—the facts which brought about this situation are as follows: The Agricultural Department has taken the position that there is a shortage of rye in this country, and in effect has invited the importation of a sizable amount of Canadian rye. That rye of course goes into the elevators, where it is intermixed with American rye. The Army has requested the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase large quantities of rye, which is needed in the occupation areas in Germany and Austria. Of course the Army under the law cannot do that purchasing directly. It must be done through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The ECA has requested the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase rye. Because of the present price of rye, it costs less according to caloric content I believe than any other available food. Here is an unusual situation as I understand. The Commodity Credit Corporation says it will not purchase that rye for the Army. It will not purchase any rye that is in an elevator in which there is any Canadian rye. The end result has been that the Army must go to the Argentine, where it is purchasing rye, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is artificially and purposely—and I use the word "purposely" because I cannot find any other explanation—depressing the price of rye in this country, to the end that they must spend huge amounts of money to bring rye back up to the support price.

In that connection I may say the two Senators from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and I called upon the Secretary of Agriculture about 6 weeks ago and asked for an explanation of what appeared to be a very ridiculous situation—a situation in which the Secretary of Agriculture says "We will deliberately depress the price of rye," to the injury of farmers in the Middle West, and at the same time at great cost to the taxpayers, since the price of rye must be brought up to the support price, after it has been artificially depressed. He was unable to give us any explanation whatever of this act. I wonder whether the Senator has any comment upon this deliberate attempt, first, to injure the farmer, and second, to make it necessary to spend huge amounts of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am sorry I am not sufficiently familiar with the particular transaction to discuss it. However, I am aware of some of the facts, and as I understand, they are very nearly as stated by the Senator from Wisconsin. I am not at all surprised at the procedure they are following, because it is merely another example of the stupidity of this organization under its present management. That was one of the reasons for my being so insistent on the floor of the Senate during the past 2 days that the control of the Corporation be placed in the hands of an independent board which could be held accountable to Congress, and not placed in the hands of a man whose sole ambition was to further the political fortunes of his party. I put

in the RECORD Friday certain records which showed how they had pulled the plugs from under the grain market in the preelection period, which in my opinion was done for the sole purpose of influencing the outcome of the election. It is very significant to note that in Secretary Brannan's reply, inserted in the RECORD, he offered no explanation whatever, and made no effort to deny the charge. The reason he made no effort to deny it is, I am sure, he knows I got my information from the records of his own office. If there is a denial, however it may be voluminous, I shall be glad to insert it in the RECORD. I think it is, I shall not say criminal, but inexcusable negligence on the part of the administration to manipulate the markets to the detriment of the farmers, purely in order to gain in many instances nothing but political advantage.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator think there is any significance in the fact that each year while the farmers have their rye in their bins, where they still own the rye, then the market is artificially depressed by actions such as the Commodity Credit Corporation has taken this year? I may say its actions in other years have had the same effect, though they have been of a different type. But we have had a history each year of the rye market being depressed until the rye gets out of the farmer's hands and into the hands of speculators, and then the Commodity Credit Corporation promptly takes steps to bring the price of rye up, after they can no longer do the farmer a penny's worth of advantage. Does the Senator think that is at all significant?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That practice has been followed in respect to many crops, as I have pointed out repeatedly during the past 2 years. I pointed out again last Friday that it was done last fall in connection with the corn crop particularly. I pointed out how the market had been manipulated as late as February 1949. I pointed out how in the month of February, in the week ending February 4, they cut purchases drastically, almost overnight, 93 percent below the preceding week, with the result that the grain market was completely demoralized for 3 or 4 weeks. They stayed out of that market, and in the early weeks of March they entered the market, with heavy buying that shot the market up. I said then that if they did not know any better, it was time we had somebody in the Corporation who did know how to operate; and, if they did know better, it was inexcusable.

The Secretary points it up again, questioning the accuracy of my statement regarding the fact when I said the Commodity Credit Corporation bill last year was passed without any objection on the floor of the Senate. If there was any objection on the floor of the Senate I wish again some Senator would rise and tell me who objected on the floor of the Senate. I should be glad to yield to anyone who wants to point out in the RECORD where anyone objected, because I cannot find it in the RECORD.

I shall read the record which was taken on the day the conference report was submitted in the Senate. It is the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. I read from the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Vermont on bringing in a conference report, but I am a little curious to know for how long it extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. This conference report gives perpetual existence to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The principal change from the Senate bill is this: The Senate bill provided for a board of five members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The House bill provided for a board of five members, three of whom must be outside the Department of Agriculture. The conference committee report provides for a board of five members to be appointed by the President, two of whom shall not be employees of the Department of Agriculture, leaving the Board comprised of three who may be employees of the Department of Agriculture and two chosen from outside the Department.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Secretary of Agriculture a member of the Board?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, indeed. I am sure he is a member of the Board.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator believe that this Board, as constituted under the terms of the conference report, will be closely integrated with the work of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. The Senator from Vermont is satisfied that probably three members chosen out of the five will be within the Department of Agriculture. The Senator from Vermont is not satisfied that the Board of five is large enough, but has hope that the next Congress may see fit to enlarge the Board if the five members prove to be inadequate.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

If there was any objection, or if there was pointed out anything objectionable in the conference report I fail to find it. I repeat, when the President signed that bill he made no statement whatever of any objection. True, he made statements later. Yes, he made numerous statements, with many of which I did not agree. But, again, he did not come back to the special session of the Congress to ask for the repeal of any of the legislation we had passed. If he had recognized this as such a dangerous piece of legislation, why did he not include that in his recommendations to the special session last summer?

Furthermore, if what the Secretary of Agriculture says is true, as he says it is, and if he recognized at the time the law was passed its inadequacy to meet the situation, why had he not bought the grain bins which were needed for the 1948 crop? He admits he had ample authority under the old law to buy all the grain bins he needed, and to put them in the name of the Corporation. He had the power to buy all the land he needed, or to lease it; but up to July 1, 1948, the effective date of the law which was passed last year, yet he took absolutely no action on the question anywhere. He was still selling grain bins. He sold them in May, June, July, August, and right straight through up to December. There was nothing in either law which said he had to do it. There was not anything written anywhere to that effect.

According to the statement of the Comptroller General, in auditing the accounts, a situation existed particularly regarding grain bins, in which the Corporation itself did not know how many grain bins it owned. It did not know whether it owned any; it did not know where they were located and did not know what was their condition. In other words, its records were in a deplorable condition. That is the reason why the farmers got caught without grain bins. The Department of Agriculture was asleep on the job and awoke in the middle of the 1948 crop year and tried to find someone to be the goat.

I still insist, Mr. President, the Corporation was selling grain bins during the period when it was bewailing the fact that it was short of grain bins. I asked the Secretary to produce to the Senate the report, which is in his own files, and to which I referred last Friday, which is so highly confidential that the Department is afraid to reveal it to the Congress and to the people because that report will confirm every statement I made last Friday. The Secretary knows it will confirm my statements.

There is another part of his statement to which I shall refer briefly. I shall not reply to it at this time, but shall reply to it at a later and more appropriate date. I refer to the answers in the RECORD which were made in reference to the shortage of $366,000,000. I merely want to recognize that statement at this time and to say that I have not overlooked it. I have not changed my position from the first time when I stated that an investigation was justified. I have reason to believe that such an investigation should and will be conducted. Therefore I shall not reply to that statement at this time.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I respectfully withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the first committee amendment, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "$1,074,000" and insert "$1,154,000", is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 16, after the word "Columbia", to

strike out "$1,064,200" and insert "$1,093,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$391,000" and insert "$550,000."

THREATENED ABANDONMENT OF AMERICA'S HISTORIC TRADITION OF SOVEREIGN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the American people now confront their most fateful decision beside which ECA, the Atlantic Pact, the rearmament of western Europe, the inevitable Mediterranean pact, and the prospective Pacific pact, are all incidental.

The fateful decision to which I refer is the question of whether we are finally to abandon forever our historic tradition of a sovereign independence and constitutional guaranties and safeguards of our economic, social, political, and personal rights and liberties.

Why is it, Mr. President, that at a time when this, and this alone, is the single decision before us, the American people are not up in arms fighting desperately to expose and oppose those forces which, behind a deliberate barrage of cynical propaganda, are steadily undermining the whole foundation of our heritage of freedom?

The reason for this tragic circumstance has been ably stated by one of America's outstanding journalists, Mr. Herbert S. Agar, when he said:

> The first duty of citizens in a country which is trying to be free is that you should know and make a greater effort to know what is going on, and also an equivalent effort to know what ought to be going on. Until you put the two things together, the news isn't dangerous. That is the reason I think there is likely to be underemphasis on the importance of interpretation and what ought to be going on, because the facts are not explosive, not dangerous, and therefore, the public doesn't resent the facts until they are related to a picture of what ought to be happening.

Mr. President, such a condition is dangerous enough, but when the facts themselves are twisted, distorted, or slanted, out of all recognition, in relation to the reality which they are alleged to reflect, no people—not even the American people—can save themselves from the inevitable consequences.

When the truth is deliberately distorted by clever falsehoods, not even the American people can distinguish between the two. Much less can they organize a united opposition to expose and check the political pied pipers who are leading us astray. As a consequence, it becomes almost impossible for those who do know what is going on to rise above a blind, negative opposition, to formulate and champion any constructive alternative course of action.

Mr. President, nowhere are these truths more startlingly revealed than in a recent editorial which appeared in the British paper, the Recorder, which was published in London on February 26, 1949. I hope every Senator who is not present will read what this British newspaper has to say about America. I quote from the editorial, as follows:

> It is chiefly from America that the talk has come of war, if finally necessary to stop Russia.
>
> But if a step involving war does become necessary to stop Russia oppressing, dominating, conquering, subjugating and enslaving little peoples, then Britain will have to make it.
>
> The United States, as again we have said before, is inexperienced in world diplomacy compared with the two or more centuries of success in foreign affairs which is the record of Great Britain. * * *
>
> American inexperience in diplomacy has brought the world nearer to war. Now the firmness of Britain will have to prevent that war. * * *
>
> The British Empire is one. It is still the greatest power in the world. The British Empire will have to take over again the leadership of the world.
>
> No use now for the United States to continue speaking and writing earnestly about responsibility of the American century of suggesting even taking a hand in the running and development of the colonies of the British Empire. The United States is still a new country of conglomerate peoples. It has much to learn. And its Constitution does not allow the moral courage which must be evident in a leader of the world. * * *
>
> And if war should come—which, please God, historic breadth and firmness such as is embodied by Mr. Winston Churchill will prevent—then America would be dragged in as she was by Japan, for Stalin does not believe that the present Russia and the present United States can long continue to live side by side in the world. And the vast industrial output of the United States would play its great part in defeating Russia as it did in the final years of the wars against Germany. * * *
>
> The British Empire has strength as well as experience and moral courage. These can yet prevent war if there is no more blundering diplomacy—American words—and if the wide and united British Empire once again, and now takes up its rightful leadership of the world.

Mr. President, for those Americans who are now concerned to read the signs of the times aright, this British editor has rendered an invaluable service. For behind this editorial are three basic facts, a full understanding of which reveals the staggering implications of a permanent acceptance by the American people of their present role in the internationalist propaganda policies and programs, to which they are now committed.

Mr. President, the first fact is that which this editor cautiously refers to as America's blundering diplomacy, which has brought the world nearer to war. This refers to the outrageous roles that two American Presidents have played as international power politicians at the secret conferences of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. As a consequence, Mr. President, the world has been torn in two. The system of sovereign independent nation states, upon which all our international law of the past 400 years has been founded, has been destroyed. Russia stands today outstretched across half the world. International free trade, based on the free-enterprise system, is now fighting for its life against a closed door, slave labor, state-controlled trade monopoly in the hands of those who are determined to use the products of agriculture and industry as a major political weapon, even at the expense of their own people. And America has been left with the impossible task of underwriting, in the midst of civil and guerrilla warfare, the two bankrupt imperial possessions of western Europe and eastern Asia.

In addition, Mr. President, America has been committed for the past four postwar years to the underwriting, at the expense of the American people, of the most savage policies of revenge, of destruction, of mass deportation, of slave labor, and deliberate mass starvation of millions of the helpless and innocent.

As a consequence of these policies, to which the American people have been committeed without even their knowledge or consent, we have been financing and legalizing the most pro-Communist policies and programs conceivable, even though they not only betrayed our American and Christian principles, but actually threatened our national security as well.

It is little wonder then, that this British editor refers to all of this as "blundering diplomacy," for, dependent as Britain is on the continued outpouring of American resources to save her own neck, the British are as determined as our own present administration not to breathe a word of the criminal betrayals that have thus far taken place, under the auspices of Anglo-American diplomacy.

Is it not tremendously significant that in the document titled "The North Atlantic Pact," which the Department of State prepared as an explanation of the pact itself, there is not a single reference to these outrageous secret agreements which continue to legalize Russian aggression while they are still on the diplomatic books?

Here, then, is what the American people are being asked blindly to embrace, namely, a series of outrageous secret agreements, which for sheer brutality and cynical repudiation of the rights of private property, and the dignity of human personality, are unmatched in history.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JENNER. Not only were there secret agreements, but is it not a fact that France and England, two of the signatories to the North Atlantic Pact, now have an open agreement with Russia that they will not enter into any coalition of any kind without Russia's consent?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is exactly correct.

Does anyone in his right mind believe, Mr. President, that the American people would adopt the permanent role of underwriting, with what remains of our blood and treasure, the suicidal consequence of these secret agreements, if the

American people were honestly told what has happened?

Mr. President, more than 2 years ago I made a demand on the floor of the Senate that those secret agreements, of which I said even the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations were ignorant, be produced for the benefit of Senators at least. I may add they have not been produced to this day.

The second fact to which the editor of this British newspaper has referred is the charge that our "Constitution does not allow the moral courage which must be evident in a leader of the world."

Mr. President, I am certain that this British editor did not have the slightest idea of calling our attention to the tragic irony that underlies his charge. It is obvious that what is referred to is the fact that our Constitution contains limitations of power and safeguards against secret commitments by an American President which involve the American people in entangling alliances with foreign nations. This is what is meant by the lack of moral courage which a leader of the world must possess.

By inference, we are led to believe that we cannot either protect our vital domestic interests or play our rightful role on the international stage if we permit these constitutional limitations of power and safeguards against secret commitments to remain on our statute books.

This is the new propaganda line, Mr. President, which has been imported from the leaders of the British Empire, and which is being faithfully echoed by pro-British administration spokesmen. Yet, before the American people permit themselves to be victimized by this propaganda and permit the permanent abandonment of the constitutional safeguards of our freedom and independence, they must be fully warned of the implications.

What are these implications? If we are to believe our British brothers, it is the moral courage of the leaders of the British Empire upon the imitation of which our salvation is dependent.

Under the British form of government, in contrast to our own, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister have the legal power, and the moral right, to commit the British people to any kind of an expedient move as pawns on the bloody chessboard of international power politics. Yet, Mr. President, the nature of these commitments and their brutal consequences have been so offensive, even to the British conscience, that British statesmen themselves have not dared to take the British people into their confidence, in spite of the fact that their actions are based on a legal and moral right to use any means to gain an allegedly justifiable end.

I want briefly to read into the RECORD a series of as sorry admissions of chicanery and deception as has ever been perpetrated on a free people, all coming from eminent Britishers.

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, Disraeli, for many years Prime Minister of England, wrote:

> All great events have been distorted, most of the important causes concealed, some of the principal characters never appear, and all who figure are so misunderstood and misrepresented that the result is a complete mystification. If the history of England be ever written by one who has the knowledge and the courage, the world would be astonished.

Those are the words of the Prime Minister of England, not the words of a Senator of the United States.

In 1932, David Lloyd George admitted in his book, Reparations and War Debts, that in spite of all the grandiose hopes and dreams that were peddled to the world by the British propagandists for the League of Nations, and in spite of all the pious pretention of the inherent justice of the Versailles Treaty, behind the scene the following condition prevailed:

> Though the peace treaties were signed, and a League of Nations was set up to keep the peace, some of the nations never abandoned their wartime mentality. The first reaction of any calamity is to create an intense desire to prevent its repetition, and to concentrate all thought and energy on that particular kind of disaster to the exclusion of all other possible or probable mishaps. The danger of that state of mind is that it is apt to be neurotic and unbalanced and that its energies are misdirected. It is haunted with the spectre of symptoms and secondary causes, and not with the root cause of the evil.

Some time later, Mr. President, Mr. Aldous Huxley, the brilliant British man of letters, charged:

> At no period of the world's history has lying been practiced so shamelessly or, thanks to modern technological progress, so efficiently, or on so vast a scale as by the political and economic dictators of the twentieth century.

Then, in 1938, the eminent British historian, Mr. H. G. Wells, warned that even in England—

> The adjustment of history to reality has become a matter of extreme urgency. * * * Common history remains still national or regional propaganda lightened by gossip.

In 1939, Lord Lloyd warned the British people that—

> We cannot, however much we flatter ourselves to the contrary, be moral and purposeful when it suits us, and flaccid, indolent, and cynical when we do not feel our self-interest threatened. * * *
>
> For nearly 20 years the English people have been living in a fool's paradise, taught that the world was moving at an ever-increasing pace toward millennium, when palpably and clearly it was rushing straight for disaster.

Mr. President, nowhere is the determination of the British leaders to deceive their people as to the terrible consequences of the commitments which those leaders are legally and morally empowered to make more evident than in the following quotation from the April 1946 issue of the Nineteenth Century and After, which reveals that—

> It was at Tehran that Russia won the peace and Great Britain lost it. Eleven countries—Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria—lost their independence. With one stroke the greatest constructive achievement of the First World War, and the principal aspiration of international liberalism during the last 100 years, were brought to nothing. The balance of power, which was being restored by the defeat of Germany, was again tipped against England, whose security, in Europe as a whole and, more particularly, in the eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf, was subjected to a new and formidable menace. And all this happened with hardly a comment in the British daily press or wireless, and without a protest from those organs of liberal and socialist opinion which, but a few years before, had stormed against the subjugation of the Abyssinians, had denounced as infamous the cession of the Sudetenland to Germany.

This, mind you, is an English publication talking.

At the same time, Mr. President, the Review of World Affairs, published in London, charged that—

> When one compares the real situation in Britain and abroad with the average political speech, one is, indeed, almost staggered. The gap between reality and declamation is almost incredibly wide.

I say, Mr. President, that the American people have been deceived time and time again, as I shall prove further on.

Mr. President, this distortion of fact and suppression of truth which has marked British diplomacy even throughout the greatest days of its imperial splendor, continues to blind the British people to the implications of the policies their leaders are pursuing, both on the international and domestic stage.

On March 5, 1949, about 7 weeks ago, the leading editorial of the London weekly Time and Tide stated:

> Whether it be true or not that a country gets the government it deserves, it cannot at the moment be said that the country gets the opposition it deserves.
>
> If Opposition policy is to be at all relevant to the coming situation, Conservatives must cease to think in terms of wooing the electors and set about the business of warning them. It may be, of course, that nothing will finally disillusion the people with the Labor Party but actual confrontation with the economic consequences of their policy, when American aid ends and the harsh winds of reality blow for the first time. But in the meantime no opportunity should be lost of emphasizing the fundamental economic realities on which the welfare state rests and from which it cannot escape. The equally inescapable fact that the mechanism for total state benevolence is inextricably interwoven with the mechanism for state despotism should be placed before the public in emphatic terms.

Mr. President, the extent to which the power of the British Cabinet goes, both on the domestic and international scene, was forcefully revealed on March 9, when Mr. Herbert Morrison, the Labor Government floor leader, refused in the House of Commons to promise that the members would be taken into confidence and permitted a debate on the North Atlantic Pact before it was signed. As his reason for this action, Mr. Morrison said that the Government, and not Parliament, must take the responsibility. Note the distinction, that the Government, and not the Parliament, he said, must take the responsibility.

Mr. President, I have gone to this length to prove how fearful British leaders are to take the British people into their confidence on domestic and international matters, which the British Cabinet is legally and morally justified in committing the British people to underwrite.

I have done this, in order to call attention to the length to which an American President must go to withhold from

the American people the truth about his actions under similar circumstances. An American President who indulges in these practices violates our whole tradition of noninvolvement in the affairs of other nations, and also his solemn oath to abide by and uphold the American Constitution.

Before the American people finally embrace a permanent repudiation of our tradition of constitutional representative Government, it is their duty to review the extent to which two American Presidents have gone to deceive them in order to cover up the grim consequences of Presidential action, which constitutes a deliberate violation of those same constitutional safeguards against involvement in the affairs of other nations, which we are now asked to surrender.

The following sordid series of deliberate deceptions that have been practiced by two American Presidents within the last decade, reveal how far these Presidents have gone, in spite of the legal restraints upon them. It is from this picture that the American people can get the clearest understanding of what is in store for them if such monstrous abuse of power is legalized by the removal of the constitutional prohibition against such practices.

Mr. President, there is no malice aforethought in my desire now to read into the RECORD the evidence of this monstrous deception of the American people by two American Presidents. I read it only because I deem it my duty to the American people to do so.

Mr. President, in the November 1943 issue of Fortune, there is a long and revealing article on the state of the nation, by Sherry Mangan, in which it is charged that—

> The American people were eased into the war by a process of discreet gradualism, and manufactured inevitability. The present study is not concerned with moral judgments on President Roosevelt's prowar policy; it wishes only to underline the fact that, beginning with his quarantine-the-aggressors speech, through the tortuous trail of cash-and-carry, revision of the Neutrality Act, the destroyers-bases deal, lend-lease, all-aid-short-of-war, to the final acts of undeclared war against Germany, the United States Government pulled the American people, bemused in the isolationism-versus-internationalism discussion, into the war by their coattails. The final desperate riposte of the Axis at Pearl Harbor merely legalized the accomplished fact.

The truth is, Mr. President, that when an American President launches on such a course of action he is forced to play the role of a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in order to hide from the American people by deliberate deception the true import of both his words and his deeds.

The extent to which such a compromising situation forces an American President to practice deception is clearly revealed in the Tyler Kent incident. Mr. Kent was an American decoding clerk in our Embassy in London who was so startled by the contents of the secret messages that passed between the late President and Mr. Churchill that he tried to get word to American Senators of the plain violations of the Constitution that were being enacted. Mr. Tyler Kent was arrested, tried in British courts for a breach of American law and, with the connivance of our State Department, was convicted and sentenced to 6½ years of solitary confinement on the Isle of Wight.

To this day, the American people do not know the contents of these messages, or the commitments they involved. Yet, on April 18, 1945, Mr. Churchill admitted to a full House of Commons, in his eulogy of the late President, that—

> As soon as I went to the admiralty in September 1939 he telegraphed, inviting me to correspond with him direct on naval or other matters if at any time I felt inclined. Having obtained the permission of the Prime Minister, I did so. Knowing President Roosevelt's keen interest in sea warfare I furnished him with a stream of information about our naval affairs. * * *
>
> When I became Prime Minister and the war broke out in all its hideous fury, when our own life and survival hung in the balance, I was already in a position to telegraph to the President on terms of association which had become most intimate and, to me, most agreeable. * * *
>
> I may mention that this correspondence which, of course, greatly increased after the United States entry into the war, comprises, to and fro between us, over 1,700 messages. Many of these were lengthy messages, and the majority dealt with those more difficult points which come to be discussed upon the level between heads of governments only after official solutions had not been reached at other stages.

Mr. President, the deliberate deception by this same administration is further revealed in a speech by Mr. Herbert Agar, contained in the April 1941, edition of "Bostonia"—the Boston University alumnae magazine, in which he said:

> I believe with all my heart that the lend-lease bill debate was a sign of the reason why our kind of a world is being defeated everywhere and is in grave danger of disappearing off the face of the earth.
>
> I am now going to talk entirely about my side in the lend-lease bill debate. My friends in the Senate and the supporters of my opinion in the Senate seemed to be lying all the while when defending the bill. Most of the newspapers in favor of the bill were lying all the time.
>
> I believe you can't win the kind of a fight we are up against now by lies. I believe the reason people like Senator Wheeler, who, after all, have not extraordinary ability, made such fools out of my friends, the supporters of my side of the Senate, was because Senator Wheeler said at least what he thought. Nobody was saying what they thought on my side. Everybody was saying "This is a bill to keep America out of war." That is the bunk! It is a bill to beat Hitler. As Senator Wheeler himself said—and he made almost all the good remarks—on the last afternoon: "This is not a bill to keep America out of war; this is a bill to enable the President to fight an undeclared war against Germany." Which is precisely what it is.

Mr. President, just within recent months we learn from Mr. Frank S. Tavenner, Deputy American Prosecutor in the Tokyo War Crimes Trial, that early in 1941 the Japanese not only postponed a decision on the Nazi request to fight Russia in the north, but went so far as to notify Hitler that Japan would not fight immediately if the United States did enter the war in Europe.

It is now clear, according to Mr. Tavenner, that this same attitude held true until some time after July 1941, when something as yet undisclosed prompted a change in policy in Tokyo.

It is true that for months during this period Mr. Roosevelt had been promoting a secret and nondeclared naval war against Germany in the Atlantic. Admiral Stark himself hoped for an incident in the Atlantic, as is revealed in his own words that—

> The Iceland situation may produce an incident. * * * Whether or not we will get an incident because of the protection we are giving Iceland and the shipping we must send in support of Iceland and our troops, I do not know—only Hitler can answer.

We now know from testimony at the Nuremberg war-crimes trial that Grand Admiral Doenitz was under strict orders from Hitler to do nothing that would offer Roosevelt an excuse to get into the European war. We also know that Premier Konoye, leader of the moderate influences in Japan, sought desperately to arrange a personal meeting between himself and the late President on Pacific matters, and it was only after Mr. Roosevelt's persistent refusal that Konoye resigned with his entire cabinet and General Tojo and the militarists took over the Government of Japan.

We now know, Mr. President, that at the Atlantic Charter meeting in August 1941, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill laid their plans to get the United States into the war via Japan. In a secret memorandum drawn up by Sumner Welles on August 11, 1941, aboard the *Augusta*, we learn that the late President committed the American people to war against Japan.

Mr. Welles also revealed that the President committed us to an Anglo-American alliance to fight the war and to rule the world when the war was over. According to Mr. Welles, the President insisted that he would not "be in favor of the creation of a new Assembly of the League of Nations, at least until after a period of time had transpired and during which an international police force composed of the United States and Great Britain had had an opportunity of functioning."

Then, Mr. President, Secretary Stimson disclosed in his own diary that on November 25, 1941, the day before Secretary Hull sent his ultimatum to Japan, Mr. Roosevelt and his war cabinet joined to discuss "how we could maneuver them—the Japanese—into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves."

Mr. President, I know that some Senators will not like this particular speech I am making; and I do not blame them. But it is the old, old story. Sooner or later truth will out. As the years have gone by the participants in some of these meetings—Stimson and others—in their diaries and in their books have told what actually happened.

Mr. President, it is a matter of record that never before have the peoples of the world been so shocked as by President Roosevelt's jocular admission at his press conference of December 19, 1944, that nobody had ever signed the Atlantic Charter, that so far as he knew there had never been any formal copy in existence, and that, in any event, it was nothing but "scraps of scribbled paper."

It is obvious, that a war that had been entered into by such shocking and devious methods, could only be prosecuted on the same basis, nor could the outcome be anything but a gigantic lie.

We now know what happened at Tehran. By the stroke of a pen, President Roosevelt tore Europe in two and turned over to Russian slavery 100,000,000 people in eastern Europe, paralyzed the European economy, and set the stage for a third world war.

Yet, 2 weeks before the national elections, which resulted in his being chosen for a fourth term, President Roosevelt solemnly declared in his speech before the Foreign Policy Association in New York on October 21, 1944:

> After my return from Tehran, I stated officially that no secret commitments had been made. The issue then is between my veracity and the continuing assertions of those who have no responsibility in the foreign field.

Mr. President, let the American people make their own choice as to whom to believe—President Roosevelt at Tehran or President Roosevelt when he talked in New York a few days before the election.

Yet just 3 months following that, President Roosevelt went to the Yalta Conference, which will go down in history as the most criminal betrayal of the aspirations and hopes of human liberty of all time. These criminal betrayals of interest and principle, for which an American President is responsible, sold Asia into the hands of Russian tyranny.

Yet, upon his return from Yalta, President Roosevelt solemnly assured a historic joint session of Congress, which I myself attended, on March 2, 1945, that—

> Quite naturally, this conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe, and not with the Pacific war.

Yet the record now shows, Mr. President, that at Yalta, by another stroke of the pen, President Roosevelt, without the knowledge, advice, or consent of the Chinese, not only sold China down the river, not only turned over to the Russians everything China had been fighting Japan 10 years to get back, but also agreed to play the role of a stooge to Stalin. According to the Yalta agreement, the outrageous commitments entered into by President Roosevelt would:

> Require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin.

Then, at Potsdam, President Truman, following the perfect pro-Russian line that Germany was the only menace to world peace, signed the Potsdam Declaration, which, in the annals of historic documents signed in the name of peace, will remain America's eternal monument of shame.

Here, then, Mr. President, is the story of what lies behind the charge that our Constitution lacks the moral courage required by a world leader of today. I remind my colleagues, and the American people, that this monstrous series of deceptions has been practiced on the American people by American Presidents, in spite of our constitutional safeguards against such outrageous abuses of presidential power.

It needs no stretch of the imagination to anticipate what lies in store for the American people if these constitutional limitations of power and moral prohibitions against such abuses are permanently removed from our statute books.

It is, indeed, strange, Mr. President, to discover that intelligent men, who now are caught in the international anarchy and the unprincipled rule of brute force which has resulted from these outrageous deceptions, would now be clamoring for the destruction of our constitutional safeguards against the repetition of such suicidal practices in the future.

It is perfectly obvious that if the American people permit these safeguards to be destroyed, instead of strengthened, they will never be able to escape from the consequences of the past, or to prevent their repetition in the future, because they will no longer have any way to hold their own leaders accountable for their actions. This is the basic cause for our present dilemma, as has been so ably stated in the leading editorial of one of this country's oldest papers, from which I quote:

> It seems to us that in relation to its foreign policy our national administration is very much in the position of that boy whose deceits had caught up with him.
>
> It is not so much that there have been mistakes and errors of judgment; our diplomatic corps could have been so many Solomons and still not avoided those. It is rather the attempt to hide the errors, to withhold the facts that might cause the country to condemn a policy before it could be undertaken, to pursue a course long after its bankruptcy was clear, to substitute propaganda for facts. * * *
>
> One could pile up instance on instance. One makeshift is improvised and proclaimed as a policy and all the agencies of propaganda are put behind it. Failure ensues. But failure is not acknowledged. Instead, another improvization is set up on the ruins of the previous one. Then the propaganda begins again.

Just as in the case of the United Nations, Mr. President, anyone who ever dared speak against it at the time when it was being considered by the Senate was regarded as a traitor and was said to be in favor of war, instead of peace; but now, instead of admitting that the United Nations is bankrupt, instead of admitting—as the political leaders in nearly all foregin countries have admitted—that it is a thing of the past, we are told that we must have the Atlantic Pact.

I read further from the editorial:

> If at this moment there is danger of war, it comes less from the cold calculations of the Russians than it does from the desperation of our own policymakers.

Mr. President, I say—I say it as a Republican—that it is partially due to the bipartisan foreign policy which we have had for the last 4 years.

I read further from the editorial:

> A successful foreign policy cannot be had until the mistakes of the past are liquidated. They cannot be liquidated until they are acknowledged. And the men responsible will not acknowledge them. They will not come ashore and face the music.

The result, Mr. President, of such a gigantic face-saving deception is the dilemma in which our own leaders find themselves. On the one hand, they demand increases in armaments, in order, as they say, to prevent war; on the other hand, they continue to follow policies which lead to exploitation, impoverishment, slavery, and human misery, all of which make war inevitable.

As Anne O'Hare McCormick, one of the late President's closest confidantes, has said:

> There is no use outlawing the atomic bomb if the great powers follow policies that produce the conditions of war.

Mr. President, if these conditions can exist in spite of our historic traditions and in spite of our legal and moral prohibitions, can there be any doubt of how fatal would be any action whereby we permanently legalize, moralize, and adopt such practices?

No one is more apprehensive than I of the threat of the Communist scourge. No one is more determined to fight, not only to prevent its spread, but also to find a means to free the hundreds of millions who have become its miserable victims. But, for the life of me, Mr. President, I cannot see how the destruction of our form of government and our way of life, and the endless squandering of our substance, in a wild-eyed world crusade against a Communist bogey, can accomplish these ends.

I believe there never has been a time when there has been such a crying need for a sober, cold-blooded, intelligent, courageous, and patriotic analysis of what America has at stake as now. The record of the past decade clearly proves this fact. Russia has had guiding her destiny a loyal, unswerving champion of Russia's interests. Britain has had an indefatigable champion of British imperial interests fighting for the preservation of the British Empire. But where are those who unashamedly have championed America's vital interests and principles in world councils and conferences of recent years?

The truth is, Mr. President, that instead, American statesmen have degraded everything America stands for by insisting upon the identification of our way of life, first, with the Russian, and now with the British.

This brings us, Mr. President, back to the third point contained in the editorial of the British newspaper The Recorder, upon an understanding of which the future of our way of life now depends. That point lies behind the statement that—

> It is no use now for the United States to continue speaking and writing earnestly about responsibility, of the American century, of suggesting even taking a hand in the running and development of the colonies of the British Empire. The United States is still a new country of conglomerate peoples. It has much to learn. The peace of the world still depends on the British Empire joined with the United States.

Mr. President, I have no desire to confuse the grave issues now before us. But

honesty compels me to recognize historic facts for what they are, and as the following facts will conclusively show, any man who continues to identify America's future and the principles for which it stands with the British Empire is not only rendering this country a terrible disservice, he is, blindly advancing a thesis which the British themselves have always repudiated.

In other words, Mr. President, the time has come for the American people to recognize the predicament they are in for what it really is. The truth is, so far as America's erudition is concerned, we are engaged not only in a struggle with Russia to preserve that tradition, we are caught in a grim struggle, at the same time, with the British imperial interests.

This side of the story has been suppressed as effectively as the treasonable pro-Russia propaganda line suppressed what Russia has been doing. And the time has come for the American people to realize that even under the terms of the North Atlantic Pact they are being maneuvered by the British into a position where the British can use everything we possess for their own national and imperial ends, except our whole history and tradition of liberty. They want no traffic whatever with the principles and ideals in which we really believe.

Mr. President, America is caught now in two world struggles, from which only the wisest and most courageous American statesmanship can save us. For years now we have not only played Stalin's game, but we have been pulling British imperial interests out of the fire. Nowhere is this fact more clearly revealed than in the story of what happened immediately following Tehran.

It was there that Mr. Churchill found all his hopes and plans for an Anglo-American domination of the postwar world shattered to bits. For the Tehran agreement destroyed any hope of restoring a balance of power upon which England had been dependent for hundreds of years, for her own security.

It was there that Mr. Churchill determined to make the American people pay to the limit for the blundering American diplomacy of which he and the American people were the victims. This is where it must have been determined that America would furnish 75 percent of the manpower in Europe and 95 percent of the manpower in the Pacific, by a man who helped trick us into the war on the basis of the slogan, "You'll furnish the guns and we'll furnish the men."

Mr. President, the extent to which this determination went is revealed in the following quotations. In December 1944, an issue, not of the Daily Worker, but of the Stars and Stripes, contained this following charge:

> British and Russian preoccupation with objectives other than the defeat of Germany was responsible for Allied failure to achieve expectations in the United States that the war in Europe would be over by now. Since D-day in France, greater preoccupation has been shown by Russia in her Baltic and Balkan campaigns intended to insure her security, and by Great Britain in Italy, Greece, and Albania to protect her life line through the Mediterranean to India than in achievement of the prime objective of our American armies—prompt defeat of Germany.

Russia was taking care of herself. England was taking care of herself. Seventy-six percent of the boys who were invading Europe were American boys. Of the 116,000 casualties among those who went into Normandy, over 80,000 were American boys.

A well-informed Britisher also made the following observation on December 22, 1944:

> As the power of Germany declines, the struggle for power between the victorious Allies takes its new form. And its new form is that which was inevitable, the Allies being who they are, namely, Britain and Russia—the form is civil war. It is prevented only where one of the two Allies is in effective military occupation. One may prophesy that wherever and whenever that military occupation is withdrawn, civil war will ensue. The next chapter of this fearful book of European history will begin.

No less an authority than Mr. Demaree Bess said, on March 10, 1945:

> Lately the roles to be played by our allies have become quite clearly defined, not only in such published treaties as the Anglo-Soviet alliance and the Franco-Soviet alliance but also through unpublished informal understandings. It is evident, for instance, that in countries occupied by the Red Army, the Russians are disposed to encourage drastic reforms, such as the breaking up of all large landholdings, the public ownership of much industry, and the liquidation of all those elements which have been hostile to the Soviet Union in the past, the reforms already begun by the Russians are far-reaching.
>
> Great Britain, on the contrary, has discouraged violent and sudden reforms in the countries she has liberated, in accordance with her traditional methods, yielding to Russia on one point in order to gain another. British statesmen are working from a permanent set of blueprints, upon principles devised long ago to safeguard the interests of the British Empire.

Mr. President, no one has more keenly analyzed the nature of this double struggle in which we have been caught than Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, the man whom President Roosevelt, himself, sent to China, who told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee just before he resigned in protest over what was going on, that—

> We began the war with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal. * * * We finished the war in the Far East, furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. The weakness of American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. We had no part in shaping the conditions that brought about these two wars.
>
> There is a third world war in the making. In diplomacy today we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialisms against Communist imperialism.

Mr. President, what could be plainer than those words of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, who for a year and a half was in China? But no; Senators upon this floor knew so much more than Mr. Hurley. As was said a little while ago by the author of the article in Fortune, Senator Wheeler was scorned when he talked upon this floor. Of course. The author says now that the other side was wrong, and knew they were wrong. The fact nevertheless remains, because Senator Wheeler and men like him were not listened to, millions of boys today are casualties as a result of the war that took place. As I said, no one has more clearly analyzed the situation in China than Gen. Patrick J. Hurley.

Mr. President, the military conduct of the last stages of the war can only be explained in terms of a secret British-Soviet agreement made in the spring of 1944, which formally established spheres of influence in southeastern Europe, implementing the Tehran agreement. The record clearly shows that Britain was far more concerned to preserve her imperial life line to the east than to throw her full weight into the major task of concluding the war both in Europe and Asia. So much for the military record.

Further proof of how Britain has used American resources for her own imperial end is found in the sequence of the international agreements to which we have been a party and that have been largely financed by the resources and taxes of the American people.

By way of illustration, Mr. President, when the Morgenthau plan was suggested to Mr. Churchill at Quebec in 1944, he so strenuously objected that Mr. Morgenthau actually purchased his cooperation with the promise of $6,000,000,000. This accounts for the real basis of the fraudulent British loan which wiped out the billions of lend-lease indebtedness of the British people and laid the foundation for the incredible folly in which we now are caught.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the British knew perfectly well just how far-reaching Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam were in terms of geopolitics. They knew it spelled the end of the old-fashioned imperial policies of the past. They knew they could no longer exploit the masses of dependent and colonial people, by supporting corrupt native one-party systems of government in the hands of those who were willing to thwart the development of their own backward peoples, for a price. They knew that a new age of imperialism had been ushered in by these outrageous secret betrayals of Europe and Asia. So, having received what amounted to the promise of a permanent subsidy by this Government in 1944, the British Government in its white paper on employment policy repudiated private enterprise and committed the British people to the managed economy of a socialistic police state.

Mr. President, it is this new kind of British imperialism which the American people have been financing during and since the war. And as each successive international agreement has been made, it has become increasingly obvious of the role America has played.

Following the Yalta agreement, the British knew perfectly well that their ability to maintain this new imperial venture depended on their continuing control of the financial manipulations of the sterling-bloc area. This is why, when the Bretton Woods agreement was signed, nothing was done to compel England to abandon her policies of financial manipulation, which has enabled her

to exploit colonial peoples all over the world.

Mr. President, the significance of these concessions has been completely lost on the American people. It is time we realized just how vicious these financial manipulations on the part of the British Empire have become. The following story comes from one of America's ablest economists, who reveals that—

During the period 1866 to 1895, inclusive, a span of 30 years, a bushel of wheat exchanged for an ounce of silver with quite constant regularity. In other words, wheat should have averaged approximately $1.29 per bushel, the monetary value of an ounce of silver. But, in 1873, for reasons that have never been explained, silver was demonetized as a medium of foreign exchange. The United States retained the domestic monetary value of $1.29 per ounce for silver and the difference between the silver price and the monetary value went to the Government as profit or seigniorage.

The demonetization of silver had a very drastic effect upon our own economy and that of other nations. After analyzing the effect, it is easy to form the conclusion that the primary reason for the demonetization of silver was to exploit those nations which were using silver as a monetary base for their monetary systems. It directly affected approximately two-thirds of the world's population.

By 1895 the price of silver as a commodity had dropped to 60 cents per ounce instead of the monetary price of $1.29 prior to 1873 and an average market value of $1.34 per ounce during the 25-year period preceding 1873. As a direct result, even though a bushel of wheat continued to exchange for an ounce of silver, the price per bushel had dropped to 80 cents. This shut off over one-half the income from a bushel of wheat and hard times prevailed in our economy. The depressive conditions in the nineties brought forth the Populist movement in the agricultural areas and the William Jennings Bryan movement for remonetization of silver.

China, India, Mexico, South America, and other nations that were using silver as a monetary base were forced into a depression and into a position where they had to furnish double the amount of commodities formerly required to exchange for an ounce of gold. These nations were thus forced into a condition of economic slavery that still exists at the present time. In fact, their impoverished condition will continue to exist until foreign exchange is reorganized on an equitable and stable basis.

The demonetization of silver which resulted in the exploitation of the nations mentioned is a dark page in the history of the western nations that pride themselves as believers in Christianity. As a comment, it would seem rather futile for the western nations to try to teach the Christian doctrine in China or India and then permit a foreign exchange dominated and under the control of the Christian nations to exploit them. In like manner, it seems futile to try to teach them our kind of government as long as we permit this exploitation to keep them in economic bondage.

That is what we are doing with the Dutch, Mr. President. We are compelling them to keep the millions of Indonesians in subjection, and it is being done with planes furnished to the Dutch by American taxpayers.

Mr. President, the following countries belong at present to the sterling area, in which the British manipulation of currency can be used to exploit others:

The United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Union of South Africa, Ceylon, Southern Rhodesia, British dependent territories, trust and mandated territories, protectorates and protected states. The following non-British countries are also part of the sterling bloc: Burma, Iraq, the Faroe Island, Egypt, Iceland, and the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

Mr. President, added to this financial exploitation, which these new economic planners of Britain have entered upon, is the following pattern of commercial exploitation upon which the British are launched. On December 21, 1943, Gen. Patrick J. Hurley wrote to President Roosevelt.

Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that only a few weeks ago I finally secured the correspondence and placed it in the RECORD. It was correspondence which for a long time, was suppressed. It was between the late President Roosevelt and Gen. Patrick J. Hurley. Here is what Mr. Hurley wrote to Mr. Roosevelt:

The deterioration of America's position in Iran and in the entire Middle East and the debacle of the principles of the Atlantic Charter was initiated in Washington. The element in the State Department that made plans for the defeat of your Iranian policy justifies the sale of lend-lease goods by the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. * * *

Because of the demands made on your time, I do not believe that you have ever fully realized that the money of the American taxpayer is being used in the name of democracy and in the name of the Atlantic Charter to establish an international trade monopoly that has for its purpose the exploitation of the people of the weaker nations throughout the Middle East, Africa, and elsewhere.

So that you may have a sketch of the gigantic operations of this monopoly, which we are supporting through lend-lease, I submit here a rough outline of the set-up of the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. and its subsidiaries.

A. The United Kingdom Commercial Corp. is a government corporation having its headquarters in London. Its subsidiary corporations operate in each of the following nations under the name indicated: UKCC (Egypt), Ltd.; UKCC (Libia); UKCC (Sudan), Ltd.; East Africa; UKCC (Ethiopia), Ltd.; UKCC (Eritrea), Ltd.; UKCC (Palestine), Ltd.; UKCC (Syria and Lebanon), Ltd.; UKCC (Iraq), Ltd.; UKCC (Persia), Ltd.; UKCC (East Africa), Ltd.; UKCC (Algiers), Ltd.; UKCC (Turkey), Ltd. In addition there are branch offices at Cyprus, Aden, and Jibuti.

B. Global subsidiaries: United States, India, Argentina, Portugal.

Then, Mr. President, as the situation in Europe continued to deteriorate, on September 16, 1945, Prime Minister Attlee sent one of the most scathing notes to President Truman that any American President has ever received. That note from Prime Minister Attlee to President Truman has not yet been made public. It still lies buried in the archives, in spite of the fact that in it the British Government charged us with a lack of good faith, insisted we could not be depended upon, and informed this Government that the British were going to get out of the Mediterranean, leave us holding the bag, and completely reorient their whole system of imperial defenses around the African Empire.

Sometime later Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Bevin met in Europe. Mr. Byrnes insisted that the American people would not stand for the use of American troops to police the British Empire. Mr. Bevin trotted out the old formula, again saying, "Give us the guns and we'll furnish the men."

This agreement, Mr. President, lies behind the Greek-Turkish loan, in which we agreed to furnish the money and the guns, yet no sooner was this agreement enacted than the British began to renege on their commitments in Greece and the eastern Mediterranean. They say "send troops, send American boys to Greece." It was in all the newspapers 2 weeks ago that England was saying "We want American troops in the Mediterranean area." The same thing happened when we signed the Italian treaty.

Yet these are the steps whereby we have moved in and guaranteed to underwrite British imperial interests that have become bankrupt economic absurdities. Meanwhile, Britain continued her exploitation of colonial areas and used the additional proceeds, along with American gifts, to expand the very collectivist philosophy of national socialism which we went to war against Germany to destroy, until today Britain's state-controlled trade monopoly and trade barter system is equal to the practices of Nazi Germany, and her government manipulation of financial control threatens to outdo the Nazis themselves.

These trends had developed by 1947, Mr. President, to the place where Mr. Bevin and Mr. Stalin got together on trade arrangements, based on the state-controlled trade-barter systems. As a consequence of the paralysis of both European and Asiatic economies, Britain was forced to make a deal to insure continued access to raw materials and markets for her manufactured goods just in order to survive. Russia's great raw material potential, and desperate need for manufactured goods, offered one way out. We now know that Mr. Stalin made tremendous offers of concessions to Britain in exchange for British neutrality in the gathering conflict between Russia and the United States. Britain, who was struggling for survival, had to make a deal either with Russia or the United States, or, if possible, with both. And that is just exactly what she has done. This is what the Marshall plan means. We bought continued British cooperation for the time being, even while Britain continues to enter into wider areas of trade relationships with Russia.

Mr. President, where does American interest lie in such circumstances? It is perfectly obvious now that we not only are not underwriting American interests, that we are not only not underwriting American principles, but that, instead, we have been maneuvered into a situation where we are building up both sides of the very conflict which we are being asked to underwrite the Atlantic Pact to avert.

And all of this, Mr. President, is taking place at the expense of our natural resources, our financial solvency, our constitutional government, and our economic freedom. We are being used to finance our own suicide as a free people.

In the first place, we are becoming permanently involved in the British scheme to use American subsidies in order to keep the colonial areas of the world permanently impoverished. So

that the President's new program to raise the standards of these people, who are the victims of this exploitation we are subsidizing, is nothing but vicious nonsense.

In the second place, Mr. President, England has reneged on her commitments in the British zone in Germany. And we are now financing 90 percent of the British costs of occupation. At the same time, when the Humphrey committee has been trying to halt the senseless dismantlement of the industrial potential of Germany, both the cost and effects of which we are continuing, the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation revealed in its report of December 31, 1948, that—

> The British and French Governments have resisted every major step in the work of the Humphrey committee. Delay was encountered in getting permission for the committee to visit the British and French zones of Germany. Agreement was never obtained to suspend all dismantling pending completion of the survey, although after long negotiation it was agreed that dismantling of most of the plants on the list would be held up until December 15, 1948.

Mr. President, the reason for this obstruction is further evidence of the British intention to exploit their position at the expense of others, including the American people.

In a recent issue of the paper British Jeweler and Metal Worker this trade publication made the following brazen admission:

> Lengthy negotiations and discussions have been conducted by Mr. Barrett (chairman of the export group) over the past 3 years with a view to fixing the future level of the German horological industry below the 72 percent of the 1938 level which had been agreed by the Allied Control Commission. It is pleasing to be able to record that the final result has been to reach agreement that the German industry is to be reduced to 50 percent of the 1938 level. This result is what we wanted to achieve, and, although there can be no doubt that the Germans will ultimately redevelop their horological industry on a strong basis, the present position means that the British industry has been given a certain amount of breathing space in order to become organized on a sound basis. The thanks of the association have already been conveyed to Mr. Barrett for his patient and untiring work in achieving this result. Following upon this, the contents of a number of German factories are to be thrown up for reparations, and Mr. W. W. Cope has recently made an inspection of these factories, as also of certain other machines which are available to this country.

Further evidence of the British determination to use American subsidies to destroy potential German competition is revealed in the fact that the British bitterly opposed any reduction in the artificially pegged exchange rate of the German mark, which would make it easier for the Germans to earn their own way by marketing their wares abroad.

Mr. President, last week I was in New York City and visited Radio City, where, at the request of the military occupation authorities in Germany, there is an exhibit of leading German corporations. Those corporations manufacture a variety of articles, among them surgical instruments. There is a big automobile concern operating in Germany, as well as other corporations. An automobile is manufactured there which cannot be shipped to the United States because of the regulation of the currency by the United States and Britain together. As a result, not one car manufactured there can be shipped to the United States. I talked with the general manager of a huge automobile concern in Germany, which operates in Europe in competition with General Motors, and in competition with an English automobile called the Austin. This German corporation leads them all and already has as many cars sold as can be manufactured in a year and a half. It is an automobile with the engine in the rear. But they cannot sell that automobile in this country because of the regulation of the currency.

Mr. President, American taxpayers are contributing $1,200,000,000 toward German recovery this year, which is equal to 6 percent of the income taxes collected from individuals in the United States this year. In spite of this fact, a recent report of what the British have plundered from just north Rhineland Westphalia during 1948—a report which the British have suppressed—discloses that the British have taken, let us say confiscated, out of this one area within the total British zone the following articles: 261,000 upholstered chairs; 15,000 clubhouse installations; 90,000 arm chairs; 500 ladies' umbrellas; 3,784 refrigerators; 800 fountain pens; 1,000 electrical railways; 949 cigarette boxes; 5,568 bicycles; 6,100 bridge tables; 13,000 ladies' writing desks; 250,000 pairs of shoes; 37,000 ladies' dresses; 75,000 ladies' sweaters; 100,000 polo shirts; 14,000 rubber baby pants; 70,000 diapers; 50,000 carpets; 300,000 bathroom carpets; 3,500,000 bottles of Steinhager liquor; 910,000 bottles of gin; 15,000 ladies' blouses; 2,100 underwear; 30,000 ladies' shirts; 12,000 children's overcoats; 2,000 children's suits; 2,500 baby dresses; 20,240 boys' sweaters; 2,000 boys' pants; 2,000 boys' jackets; 16,000 pairs children's socks; 50,000 aluminum pots; 29,000 bread toasters; 21,314 toilet outfits; 14,757 wash bowls; 76,000 book cases; 4,000,000 electric bulbs; and 76,000 mattresses.

Mr. President, the same British determination to run her own affairs in her own way, and her refusal to subordinate her immediate interests to a future overall good, is nowhere better stated than in a recent statement by Christopher P. Mayhew, British Under Secretary of State, who told us on February 23, 1949, that so far as the Marshall plan was concerned—and so far as Britain's willingness to integrate its program with the European recovery program, as a whole was concerned—"The purpose of Marshall aid is to set us free from dependence on America. We have not the slightest intention of modifying our economic, our social, or our political plan in order to qualify for aid."

Mr. President, the same condition exists in the Far East. During the past few weeks a British trade mission has been negotiating with our far eastern experts in the State Department concerning the export levels which are going to be permitted the Japanese. Here, too, the American people are subsidizing 70,000,000 people who have been crowded once more back on to these small islands off the Asiatic coast. If this is not to become a permanent penal colony, subsidized by the American taxpayer, the Japanese have got to manufacture and export—or die. With the grave threat of communism spreading throughout the Orient, we could not make a more fatal mistake than to condemn the Japanese to such a fate. Yet, recent unpublished reports of the results of these trade conferences with the British reveal that they have succeeded in getting our American representatives to retreat from their former liberal attitude toward Japanese export levels, which means that the British are willing to risk the loss of Japan along with China by insisting upon continued exploitation, at our expense, of the most highly industrialized people in the Orient.

Finally, Mr. President, we now learn that Britain is foremost among the Marshall plan countries who have entered into 91 separate trade pacts with the Soviets and their satellites—the very ones the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] was asking me about a few minutes ago—under the terms of which $3,000,000,000 worth of goods a year are flowing across the iron curtain, and at this very moment Britain is negotiating a new trade agreement with Russia that involves the shipment of such strategic materials as tin and rubber, and durable goods to the Soviets.

At the same time we learn, Mr. President, in a report from Paris on March 12 by the United Press, that a high ECA spokesman admitted "the present ECA policy is to encourage European countries on both sides of the curtain to stimulate and restore necessary and essential east-west trade."

The tragedy is, Mr. President, as the London Economist stated on January 8, 1949, that in spite of all the aid we are pouring out—in spite of the vicious exploitation of the other people which we are subsidizing:

> Whatever its labors, western Europe cannot achieve a balance by 1952 on the basis of its present plans, of its present standards of living, and of the existing conditions of world trade. If no further action is taken, the shock to the European economic system caused by the ending of foreign aid will bring such economic and social dislocation that political stability will be undermined. The malady is more obstinate and deep-seated than was thought.

So the London Economist intimates that when the billions of dollars which are at present expected to be provided under ECA are exhausted, there will be demand for more and more and more money. Some Englishmen say they are going to need such help for 10 years after 1952.

Mr. President, the time has come for America to reevaluate its whole position in the present world predicament and honestly and clearly to analyze the conditions under which our interests, our principles, and our future can best be secured. The American people are still half-drugged by the poisonous collectivist propaganda which has popularized both the Russian and British economic and

social experiments. Yet this whole collectivist trend has depended for its very life upon the outflow of the resources and the wealth which the American people have accumulated under 150 years of economic freedom and personal liberty.

The time, indeed, has come to correct the evil consequences of America's blundering diplomacy of the past few years, to reassert our traditional moral courage as a people who believe in freedom, and no longer to be intimidated or propagandized into the suicidal identification of our form of government and our way of life with any other modern ideology, which is only an ancient tyranny masquerading in a modern dress.

To those who may not agree with me, to those who may possibly say I am prejudiced, Mr. President, I want to reemphasize the evil and the dangers that are involved in any American foreign policy which is based on a complete identification of America's interests with the vicious and brutal imperialist practices of the British Empire, or any other imperialism.

I call as witness no less a person than the late President Roosevelt himself, whose real attitude toward British imperialism is revealed by Elliott Roosevelt in his book As He Saw It.

During the Atlantic Charter meeting President Roosevelt is quoted as saying to his son:

> The British Empire is at stake here. * * * We've got to make it clear to the British from the outset that we don't intend to be simply a good time Charlie who can be used to help the British out of a tight spot, and then be forgotten forever.
>
> I think I speak as America's President when I say that America won't help England in this war simply so that she will be able to continue to ride roughshod over colonial peoples.

Then we learn, that at the Casablanca Conference the late President added the following grim warning as to just what America's underwriting of the colonial system really meant when he said:

> The thing is, the colonial system means war. Exploit the resources of a Burma, an India, a Java—

That is what the Dutch are doing—exploiting the resources of Java, as President Roosevelt said, according to his son Elliott—

> take all the wealth out of those countries and never put anything back into them, things like education, decent standards of living, minimum health requirements—all you are doing is storing up the kind of trouble that leads to war. All you are doing is negating the value of any kind of organizational structure for peace even before it begins.

Mr. President, the record now clearly shows that we are engaged in perpetuating these very colonial systems which President Roosevelt admitted meant war, exploitation, poverty, suffering, and human degradation. And we are launched on a course of action which means that the American people will be increasingly exploited, regimented, and impoverished, the farther down this road we travel.

Again I say that it is time the United States Senate dragged the whole sorry history of how we were tricked into this last war, and sold out both to Russia and to western imperialism during and since the war. Then it is our solemn duty to repudiate these outrageous secret betrayals of American interests and principles and start afresh, by rewriting American foreign policy, on the basis of American principles right here on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by George Sokolsky under the heading "These days," published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 26, 1949, which bears out the very thing I have spoken about this afternoon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The assumption of every people at war is that their arms will lead to victory. But the meaning of victory is often ambiguous. For instance, in the Revolutionary War, victory for the Americans had to mean independence; but during the Civil War neither side could be or ever was sure of what victory would bring.

In World War I, victory meant the defeat of the Kaiser's Germany, but that was insufficient for Americans, so we invented several goals—"the war to end all wars," "the war to make the world safe for democracy," "the 14 points."

Yet all these phrases were surprisingly meaningless in themselves and therefore the victory dissolved itself in an astonishingly short time into a defeat and into the need for a new war.

World War II was fought without the terms of victory. It was a blind date with destiny. The most that could be said was "down with Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo," minor figures on the historic scene.

Conferences were called at Quebec, Moscow, Tehran, Cairo, and Yalta to discover what victory might mean.

Yet the closest to a program for victory was the so-called Morgenthau plan, which was at best a Carthaginian monstrosity, and the Charter of the United Nations, which laid the foundation of a world state.

Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, correctly appraised that when he said:

"* * * Basically, these problems could all be reduced to one great question. How far would the Soviet Union go in exploiting the postwar situation so as to extend its territory and increase its might?

"This question was no idle speculation. We had seen the boundaries of Russia extended first in 1939 and 1940 at the expense of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Finland.

"As the war went on, it became clear that the promise of freedom to Poland would not include these eastern Polish provinces, which were, in fact, eventually surrendered by Poland to the U. S. S. R. After the war's end, parts of Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary were also added. By 1945 the boundaries of the Soviet Union had been pushed farther to the west than ever before in Russian history."

In a word, to Soviet Russia, victory meant imperialism and in that direction Stalin guided his nation during the Hitler-Stalin alliance, during the partnership with the United States and Great Britain, and during the cold war. That imperialism is completing itself in the conquest of east Asia.

Blundering through a war without meaning is not likely to produce peace. Talleyrand realized that at the Congress of Vienna, where the powers which had coalesced against Napoleon fell apart when their symbolic enemy had disappeared.

Talleyrand struggled to give peace a meaning—a European meaning. He only succeeded after Napoleon reappeared: Then Europe gave itself a century of peace.

The yearning of the Western World is for permanent peace—that is, a peace as permanent as human institutions can be. But peace is impossible while one nation is practicing imperialism; it is equally impossible when great states dominate small states; or when nationalism is interpreted to mean exclusive hatred. Peace must be of the spirit of civilization.

In some respects, the deepest contribution of the West to civilization has been freedom of exchange of knowledge and ideas. Throughout the wars of Europe for 1,000 years that freedom was uninterrupted.

The symbols of civilization were hardly involved in the meaning of victory. That was not true during World War II, which destroyed without regard to the inevitable necessity for rebuilding. Nor can it be true in the imperialism of Soviet Russia, which bears an Asiatic grudge against the civilization of the West.

The question then must arise as to whether the North Atlantic Pact is more than the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the Nine-Power treaty, the Stimson doctrine, and similar efforts toward giving meaning to victory.

Can the North Atlantic Pact mean more than the covenant of the League of Nations or the San Francisco charter? The answer hinges upon the spiritual objectives of the statesmen: Do they give meaning to victory and peace in terms of their own civilization or are they merely bringing a bad situation to an end? This needs to be answered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bricker	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Bridges	Hill	Miller
Butler	Hoey	Morse
Capehart	Holland	Mundt
Chapman	Ives	Murray
Chavez	Jenner	Myers
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Douglas	Kefauver	Robertson
Eastland	Kem	Russell
Ecton	Kerr	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ferguson	Knowland	Sparkman
Flanders	Langer	Taylor
Frear	Long	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thye
George	McClellan	Tobey
Gillette	McGrath	Tydings
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Withers
Hayden	Magnuson	Young

Mr. KERR. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are detained in a meeting of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

GOVERNMENT AT THE CROSSROADS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long. I wish to express a few ideas that I have had on my mind.

I should like to outline very clearly what I mean when I refer to the situation which we in the United States face today. There are two rival paths between which

our country and our economy must choose. In other words, we are at the crossroads. One of the roads is that which has been taken by the countries from one end of Europe to the other, the road to increasing Government intervention in the affairs of the people. We can call the last stop on that road anything we choose to call it, such as socialism, fascism, collectivism, paternalism, totalitarianism, or what have you, but the net effect is the same, namely, a government increasingly monopolizing the private affairs and regimenting the lives of the people. Such a course would destroy the most significant thing in American life, which stands out like a beacon light to the world, but which the world does not seem to appreciate very much, namely, our system of checks and balances. That we must maintain.

The other road open to us is the road of freedom, a dynamic, forward-looking approach. Recognizing that changing times require changing outlooks and changing procedures, at the same time the road of which I now speak leads to the encouragement of private investment and the encouragement of the individual to develop his initiative and his inventiveness; in other words, it is the road which calls for the individual to expand and grow and develop. To follow that road, Mr. President, means more private business, more jobs, more wealth, more industries; it means economic health in America. Those who take that road recognize, of course, that ours is a complex society, that government cannot simply stand by or stand aside and do nothing, but at the same time, when it does take action, it should not be to regiment or dictate or interfere with private rights, but to encourage, stimulate, and help the private citizen meet his challenges.

The greatest single problem in the United States today is the need to awaken our people to the threatened loss of our heritage of freedom. The greatest menace to that freedom does not come solely from communistic infiltration.

The Communist menace is a serious one, as outlined yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]; and I do not minimize the effect of that great movement upon the world stage. But, Mr. President, infinitely more serious is the apparent lack of understanding—we may term it apathy, if we please—of some of our people toward the trends which inevitably will lead us down the long, dreary road to a concentration-camp economy and a socialized government. We can fight communism at home and abroad, but it is more important that on our American stage we awaken to the impact of forces, that we shake off the apathy, if we may term it such, or the lack of comprehension, perhaps, of many of our people in regard to what is the real problem in the United States and what is our responsibility to the world.

Mr. President, as everyone realizes, this little globe on which we live is a very small speck in creation. Sometimes we think it is all of creation, but geographically it is only a very small, insignificant piece of dust. On this piece of dust there are 2,300,000,000 human souls; but less than 300,000,000 of them seem to have any comprehension or understanding of what we call the American way. I am sorry to say that in this country there are a number of persons who, because they were born to the American way in this blessed land, take it for granted, and fail to realize that our American way can be dissipated, just as a material fortune can be dissipated. In other words, eternal vigilance is imperative and necessary; otherwise, we will go down the long, long trail that other nations have followed toward state socialism, and eventually toward a police state.

Mr. President, some terms are used in so many different ways by various persons that they become virtually meaningless. We hear such words as "democracy" used, and then we hear Joe Stalin say that he is the great exponent of democracy. We hear words such as "liberalism" used, and then we find that those who stand for curtailing individual liberty and initiative and putting into the hands of the state the control of the lives, property, and business of the people are called liberals. So it is obvious that mere terms mean nothing.

What we must do is take off the hide and see what lies underneath. Many a wolf is camouflaged in sheep's clothing. In other words, Mr. President, I am attempting to say that the real fifth column in the United States is the feeling of indifference and complacency which lends itself to the campaign of misinformation on basic ideas which has been and still is under way. Let me illustrate my point by a little story which I was told the other day: It is said that a few years ago there came to the United States a prominent German professor who, although he understood the English language, of course, did not understand the idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms which are used in the United States. One of his friends was always saying, when something pleased him, "That is good horse sense" using that expression as synonymous with the expression "common sense." So one day the German said to him, "What is this horse sense you talk about so much?"

His friend replied, "That is something that a jackass ain't got."

Mr. President, somehow I feel that we need more horse sense or more common sense in appreciation of what we have in this country of ours.

As I have said, I feel that the world has been contracted. The old dogmas and old concepts, which we thought were inviolate, have to a large extent had to be replaced by new ones. What do I mean? In the days of Washington it took weeks, sometimes months, to cross the ocean; we were physically isolated; but today, with our inventions, with the atomic bomb, with planes traveling 750 miles an hour, with guided missiles that will go 2,000 miles, with the creation, as it were around this entire country, of a radar screen, there is recognition of the fact that the world has been contracted, and, with its contraction into a relatively small piece of land, we find that every other nation is literally in every other nation's back yard. With that comes the responsibility that is ours.

Tomorrow the Committee on Foreign Relations begins hearings on the North Atlantic Pact, public hearings to be held in the caucus room. We must again recognize that we are stepping out into a new field; we are embarking on a new adventure; but we are doing it because the world has been contracted, and man's ingenuity and inventiveness have brought us to this impasse. We have placed America literally at the back yard of every other nation, and vice versa; hence the pact. Much has been said about the pact. Much has been said which would be valid were we living even 25 years ago or 50 years ago, before the advent of the airplane, before radio, before the bomb, before the guided missile. But today we find ourselves literally in a new world. We find ourselves facing new problems such as the founding fathers never faced. They call, however, for the old common-sense dogmas and also for a revaluation of our domestic affairs and a revaluation of our relationship to the world.

Mr. President, if you and I fail to inform ourselves of these tides, as I have called them, or these currents, we shall not be adequately meeting the challenges which, whether we be Senators or whether we be citizens, confront us today. One of the tides we must meet head-on is the tremendous fear that America will be inadequate. I, for one, do not have that fear. As down through the decades there has been the golden thread of faith in the Almighty—true, sometimes in only a remnant of our people—I feel it is present now more than ever, faith that we shall be guarded and guided to do what is necessary, and that we shall be adequate. I do not ask that action in the consideration of this matter be taken on a political basis. I think the problem is so large and the consequences that might follow are so serious that it is well that all political alinements be thrust aside and that we face the situation head-on. In fact, if we are to succeed in counteracting certain trends in America today, it can only be because serious, sober-minded men of all parties, sober-minded men of all religious faiths and of diverse political faiths, join hands.

One of the trends on the domestic front, Mr. President, which I think we should consider very seriously, relates to certain significant facts about our Government. I think history will demonstrate that there never was a time when over a long period of years, the government of any nation became, as it were, omnipotent and took unto itself the management—yes, the political thinking and sometimes religious thinking of its people—that it did not become a police state. I am not at all pessimistic about the figures I am going to cite, but they are very significant. They are figures which should really be given consideration.

I may say that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on many occasions has on this floor told about the centralization of wealth in certain corporate interests. Today I want to cite facts about a corporation, the American Government, which will truly

be revealing as to how much economic power is lodged in its hands.

Do you know, Mr. President, that the Federal Government is the world's biggest banker, with $10,109,000,000 in loans outstanding at the end of 1947? That is one-fourth of the total loans held by the 15,000 banks of the United States. It is important for us to know that the Federal Government is today the world's largest security holder, with securities having a face value in excees of $20,000,000,000.

The Federal Government operates the largest life insurance company, with more than $40,000,000,000 of life insurance in force.

The Federal Government is the world's biggest farm-mortgage holder, with about one-fourth of all the farm mortgages in the United States.

It is important, Mr. President, for you and me to know that the Federal Government is the biggest single landowner in the Nation, owning 36 percent of the total American land area, 24 percent of the continental United States. If concentrated in one place, the Federal land would exceed the combined acreages of all the following States: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Ohio, Alabama, Kentucky, and Indiana.

It is important for us likewise to realize that the Federal Government is the biggest landlord of the Nation. I am not now referring to the vast acreage owned by the Federal Government, but to the Government as a landlord. The most recent figures showed there were 407,000 families paying rent to the Federal Government. For another 150,000 families the Federal Government pays annual contributions to local housing authorities, and of course that will be extended when the housing bill we recently passed becomes the law of the land and the Government undertakes the building of more and more houses.

Besides being the country's biggest landlord, the Federal Government is also the Nation's biggest tenant. It is holding by lease 340,000,000,000 square feet of space over the entire country.

It is important for us to know that the Federal Government is the biggest employer in the Nation. In 1947, exclusive of the armed forces, it employed more than 2,000,000 men and women. Last year, throughout the 48 States, State and local governments combined, numbering 155,000, had only about 2,000,000 employees. At the present time the Federal Government has more than three and a half times the number of civilian employees it had in 1932.

It is important for us to know that the Federal Government is the world's biggest foreign trader and controls all exports from the United States through loans and grants to foreign countries, and has financed about one-third of our total exports.

It is important for us to know that the Federal Government has the largest income in the world, an income exceeding the aggregate incomes of the 6,000,000 farmers in the United States.

It is important for us to know that the Federal Government is the world's greatest spender. In the fiscal year 1947–48 it spent approximately $37,000,000,000 or $38,000,000,000, which is more than two and a half times the amount spent by all the local governments in the Nation. It is important to know that the Government spends approximately 20 percent of the Nation's income at this time. Yes, it is important for us to know that one out of every six adult Americans receives some money from the Federal Government. It is important for us to know that, on the average, every man, woman, and child in the United States spends approximately $300 a year to operate the Federal Government.

It is important for us to know that the debt now stands at more than $250,000,000,000, which amounts to more than $1,700 for each individual. It is important to know that we are coming closer and closer to a time when we shall have to live under a government controlled by a bureaucracy, unless the Government maintains inviolate its system of checks and balances. Such bureaucratic power will cause this Government to become more and more autocratic, and liberties will go out the window. Perhaps we should not call it a Socialist state, but, Mr. President, when we refer to England—and we hear much about England and what is going on there—I thought it might be worth while if the figures could be gotten together to show the direction in which the trend is leading.

If the representatives of the States in the Congress, in the Senate and in the House, will see to it that the vast sum of money which is collected from the taxpayers is so spent that the Government itself shall receive a dollar's worth for every dollar invested, and will see to it that as much of the balance as may be available is siphoned back to the States, without strings, perhaps, Mr. President, we can stop this current which is apparent not only in this country but abroad in the world everywhere, of the state taking hold of the wealth and assuming great power, automatically becoming, as is the case in many other nations, a police state. Then freedom, liberty, and incentive go out the window.

Mr. President, I trust that both parties will make it a point to consider the Hoover report and, while they may not adopt it in its entirety, I hope they will take it, segment by segment, accept those portions which are applicable to the present, and see to it that the report is adopted and put into effect, to the end that more of the tax money which is collected from the American people may be available to the States, because in many cases the States themselves are in no position to levy additional taxes because the Federal Government so largely preempts the field.

So, Mr. President, a challenge is presented to this august body. Today we are debating an appropriation bill. Machinery for the purpose is not adequate at the present time, but I hope it will not be long before we see to it that when appropriation bills are passed a provision is placed in each bill which will make it possible when we come to the end of the session to fit the national income to the cloth; in other words, to provide that appropriation bills shall be automatically cut by some kind of a review process.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. How is the Senate to carry out the idea of the Senator from Wisconsin automatically to cut appropriation bills, and how are we to keep from making appropriations when the Senate and the other House continue to pass bills which authorize appropriations for whatever purpose Congress has in mind.

If the Senator will permit me, briefly——

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very happy to yield further.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think if we cut appropriations, Congress will not authorize so many of them, but when Congress passes a law by voice vote, which authorizes an appropriation of $5,600,000,000, what are we to do about it except to appropriate the money?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few days ago I covered a part of the answer to the Senator's question. We were at that time considering foreign relief. Personally, I feel that the Appropriations Committee has been lax in the past in acting on the assumption that authorization is equivalent to appropriation. If that policy should continue to be followed, I feel that the Appropriations Committee would be lax, particularly in relation to foreign aid. I shall explain why I say that, and that will probably give the distinguished Senator the answer to his question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WILEY. In a moment. When the foreign-aid question was before the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and every other member of the committee said that because of the changing world, because of the known fact that the value of the dollar is increasing in purchasing power and costs are falling and because of improved conditions in Europe, it was becoming more and more apparent that the European nations were becoming more and more adequate, and that factor, as well as others, including the need in our own Nation of taking care of unemployment and looking after our own economy, should be considered and judgment rendered thereon by the Appropriations Committee. It was felt that when and if the appropriation were made, which would be in June or July, factors would be known which were not known in November when Mr. Hoffman's estimate was received. Those are things which make it imperative for the Appropriations Committee to screen the items and arrive at an independent conclusion, and not follow the lead of the authorization.

I made the suggestion that I hope we shall become more effective, efficient, and adequate, so that we shall not continue, as we have heretofore, passing appropriation bills, irrespective of what we think the Government can collect in taxes. In other words, when the tax money comes in and we have a final estimate, we should fit our appropria-

tions to the amount of money available. That is important, for the reason that the Federal Government has outstanding a debt of $250,000,000,000, and while, during the past 2 years, we have had a balanced budget and have reduced the debt, it is now important that we do not go into the red, and that, above everything else, we set for the world an example in fiscal policy, in balancing our budget, and in making ourselves economically sound.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made a suggestion, which I think merits consideration, as to what should be done in relation to appropriations. His suggestion was that all the authorizations be considered toward the end of the season in one bill, and then the desired reduction could be accomplished. I do not know whether that can be done; but, Mr. President, the time calls for constructive thinking on this whole subject, because we do not live unto ourselves alone; other nations and this Nation are in one great family.

We also have the Russian impact, whatever that may mean. I, for one, feel that there is a great deal of hysteria, and I feel it more strongly today, since it appears that the Russians are willing to talk. Of course, we should talk with Russia, but we should lay down the terms upon which we will talk. When I say "Russians," I do not mean the great Russian people; I mean Joe Stalin and his confederates. They are the great international poker players. They have through the centuries taken lessons from the Europeans, and we are neophytes. We have paid a terrible price because of that fact. But we are learning. In view of the fact that the initiatory steps are in the hands of the Executive, I, for one, feel that we should leave the decision to the Executive. In other words, he should answer the proposition which appears to have come over the wires today.

Mr. President, I do not want to consume too much time, but there are a few domestic considerations which I think require our attention. I believe that we should take action on the displaced persons question. I have offered a number of amendments to the present law, on which I feel action should be taken. I think the appropriate subcommittee should consider the amendments. I say that, having in mind everything the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] said yesterday, and recognizing that we are dealing with international personages, Mr. Stalin and his crowd, who are playing an infiltration game. Yet we know that a large percentage of the displaced persons after being properly screened can be brought to this country, where positions are available to them. In my own State, because of the failure to bring displaced persons to this country, the farmers have served notice that unless they can get them in 30 or 40 days they do not want them, because they would have to take their families and feed them during the winter. They want them throughout the season. I think that is one of the things to which the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary should give consideration.

I now wish to speak briefly about another important subject, namely, our obligations as Americans. While we claim to be heirs of all the ages, it is our obligation to preserve the heritage that is ours. We know that the founders of the Republic did not teach, as many of our people teach now, that ease and luxury are the essence of existence. Rather, they recognized that what was needed was the hardening of the muscles, the joy of work, of accomplishing, of striving, and they stressed the importance of a sense of honor, of self respect born of integrity, and of happiness in the things of the spirit. The founders of the Republic reached out and gave us a system of checks and balances such as the world had never seen before, and is not witnessing now except in our own country.

They knew that this system could be maintained only by free men who had the vision and the integrity to maintain freedom of speech, freedom of worship, a free press, right of trial by jury, right of petition, the right to hold office, and the right to work. They knew that men must have a sense of obligation to preserve these freedoms, or freedom could disappear, as, to repeat, material wealth could be dissipated. They knew that human passions and prejudices becloud men's vision, so that oftentimes ideas garbed in sheep's clothing would prove to be ravenous wolves ready to devour the fabric of the Republic.

With reference to the subject of education, we must recognize that it is as much our task as it is the task of the school teacher and the professor. We have known of people who have obtained doctor's degrees and master's degrees in the universities of the country, and yet simply accumulated a lot of worldly wisdom. They did not have the qualities the fathers had. That is why folks like Miss Bentley and others, and some famous Englishmen, are not sensing the worth whileness of the great system of freedom which England still preserves. They love their country, but they are literally sabotaged mentally by the Marxist theory as exemplified by Stalin and his gang.

Our fathers knew that freedom was not compatible with laziness of body and of mind. They knew that if a people grew complacent and let a central government or a government of individuals or a group gain complete control—in other words "let George do it"—they would soon find that an Adolf or a Benito or a Stalin would take over.

Last year, in San Francisco, Mr. President, coming down from Coit Tower which overlooks San Francisco Bay and affords one of the finest sights in America and the world, I noticed that the elevator man spoke with an accent. I said to him, "Where were you born?" I still thrill to his response, because he said, "Sir, I came to this country 44 years ago, and I landed at that pier," and he pointed to the pier. "I came from Italy. But this is my country."

What did he mean? He was not like many of those born here, who do not appreciate America. He came here and raised his family, saw his children go to our schools and enjoy the freedoms which are here; he acquired a home, voted for the candidates he wanted, and went to his own church. He had a comparison in his mind, so he said, "This is my country." I admit that a thrill went through me, as I realized that what we need in this land more than anything else is an appreciation of what we have here.

There are those, of course, who will say that there is not absolute material equality, but there is a vast equality such as no other people know. As we look back over the years and see what our people have accomplished, we must somehow get a little iron in our own systems, and be adequate to meet the problems as they come over the horizon.

"This is my country." That is what I would want for all of us to feel and know, and not simply be mentally sabotaged by the mechanical things which arise day by day.

We have many problems, economic problems, the problem of balancing our budget and not going into a wild spree, thinking that the world can be remade by our planning.

One of our great editorial writers, Walter Lippmann, said in his column a few days ago:

> It is significant, I think, that we have done well—perhaps in the perspective of history brilliantly well—where we have used American military and economic power for broad general purposes—to redress the balance of power, to prohibit aggression, to help others to help themselves. But we have not done well where we have undertaken to intervene directly and intimately in the internal affairs of distant and alien countries and have entangled ourselves in the business of governing or managing them.

So, Mr. President, we see that what is needed is horse sense, common sense, balanced thinking.

Mr. President, I wish to mention one other subject in connection with this discussion. In our campaigns and otherwise we have seen put into play what I have called "security psychosis." Many have been fooled into believing that if and when they are promised security all will be well; that the Nation should and could look after everyone's physical welfare from the cradle to the grave. That is a very intriguing but a very disintegrating concept. Many of the people who are in favor of this policy are humanitarians, good citizens, and, of course, they call themselves liberals, advanced thinkers. They are blind to the fact that if you follow this idea to its lair you will find that it will result in spending your money for you and in giving away your right to control your own business and social relations, and, what is worse, it will mean delimiting your freedom and liberty by imposing restriction on your personal conduct and activities. These paternalists fail to realize that man cannot long remain free if he throws upon the Government or upon any group of men the obligation of looking after him and relieve him of his responsibilities and duties of life, and, what is more, his duties as an American citizen. Duties and responsibiilties are a part of a freeman's inheritance. The end result of the promises to set you free from fear and want and insecurity and injustice, of insuring you against all hardships, and creating an army of public servants to watch over you and to make

you happy and virtuous—the end result would be the welfare state with no checks and balances to protect the freedoms of man—the welfare state such as they have it in Russia, such as we have seen it under Hitler and Mussolini. A welfare state, I repeat, means a police state.

It is very apparent I am sure, to all Senators that with this great conflict between those who believe in maintaining individual freedom by strengthening the individual and the power of local self-government, and the pseudo-liberals or paternalists who are hastening so-called social reforms. I say "so-called," because many of them are nothing but wolves covered with sheep's clothing who, by increasing the powers of a centralized national government, would bring about a welfare state. So, business, the farmer, the laboring man, and the Nation itself are at the crossroads. Where are we going? That is for us to decide. It is the action we take here that decides what corner we shall turn. We shall have to be on guard against the synthetic thinking of those using the channels of psychological warfare.

Where did we learn of this psychological warfare? That is another one of the isms which have come from Europe. Hitler used it. Since the war ended Stalin, by the use of psychological warfare, has gained control of 100,000,000 people and never fired a shot in doing so. It takes the form of a campaign of fear, worry, false suggestions, promises, which calls for keen analysis by the individual American citizen. Much of this psychological warfare hides, unfortunately, behind our great freedoms of speech, of the press, and of the radio. Are we taking a different direction than we should take? Are we taking a different direction because of American ingenuity and invention, and the airplane, and the atomic bomb?

Where are we going? We have got to decide. If and when the Senate ratifies the Atlantic Pact, Mr. President, which I spoke of in the beginning, we shall have taken a new tack. We must keep our eyes open to the responsibilities we assume if we ratify the pact, but we must also keep our eyes open to the responsibilities if we do not adopt the pact.

We have become involved in two World Wars. The first was after the Kaiser had come to believe, and in this he was advised by Bernstorff and others, that we would not fight. Yet we got into the First World War.

In the Second World War Hitler and the Japs thought we could not prepare, that we were not efficient and competent enough to get ready. So Pearl Harbor followed. We got into that war.

Now there is under consideration a new pact. We are now trying to take a new tack. We are now notifying the world as we did in Revolutionary days, what our position is, only we have enlarged our scope. In the days of the Revolution our first flag bore the motto "Don't Tread On Me," and the serpent appeared on the flag. We are now saying "Don't tread on me and my copartners."

There is a domestic highway leading down toward the socialistic state, or in the other direction leading away toward providing for our people more and more independence. There is a highway in our international affairs which on the one hand leads toward the pact, and if we move in that direction we will notify the world where we stand, so there can be no mistake about it, or we can move in the other direction and let Russia and other aggressors know or think they know that we will stand by and do nothing. It is not an easy decision for us to make. But a decision will have to be made, not in the light of the circumstances which prevailed in the world 150 years ago, but entirely on the circumstances as they prevail in the world today, in the light of America's ingenuity and her invention.

A few words and I shall close. I believe that all of us can profit by the statement I made in the beginning respecting "horse sense." We do not need a lot of educated "nincompoops" to direct our course. What we need is the vision the fathers had, so we may do what is necessary under the circumstances. We have to have faith in our course. We have to know that we will do what is right, that we will "do justly," that we do not want war with the great Russian people or any other people, that we will not engage in aggressive war, but that we will live at peace with all the peoples of earth. And, what is more, that we will extend our hand continually to help the unfortunate.

Then we ask understanding from those whom we help, so that they will not permit themselves to be targets of psychological warfare, which is built on lies and misrepresentations. Of course, we are living in a human world. But we are something else. And that something else will carry on when we have laid aside this mortal shell. In this age, as someone has said, the greatest age in the world's history, with the greatest challenges, it is our function to perform adequately and to have faith that the great American people will meet every challenge, will face courageously every situation, and will be adequate in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have heard some of the remarks of the able Senator from Wisconsin dealing with the dangers of recurring national deficits, and with that thought I am in complete accord. The Senator said he would like to see the Appropriations Committee provide the machinery to bring the national budget into balance, and not appropriate more money than was collected; in other words, to make expenditures equal income. I am in accord with that statement.

Mr. WILEY. I feel flattered, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have always been in accord with that theory. My purpose in rising was to tell the eminent Senator from Wisconsin that I have pending before the committee of which he is a member, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, a constitutional amendment which would make it mandatory in peacetime for the Congress to live within its means. It simply provides that whenever Congress appropriates more money than the national income, the President is authorized to reduce all appropriations by uniform percentages so as to bring expenditures into balance with income. If the Congress wanted to spend more than the Government collected, it could levy new taxes, so that then the President would be forbidden to reduce the appropriations, because the new taxes would make up the deficits.

The proposed constitutional amendment has had the benefit of the thought of some of the leading economists of the country, some of our great financiers, and giants of industry with whom I have corresponded over a period of 5 or 10 years. I am a little reluctant to mention their names, but they are preeminent in the field of finance and budgeting.

I hope the Senator, who I know is an advocate of the philosophy I am expressing, will try to prevail upon his fellow members in the Committee on the Judiciary to get that constitutional amendment to the floor of the Senate, because I feel certain that it will receive sympathetic consideration by the Congress. I am vain enough to believe that the State legislatures would ratify it.

It is absolutely ridiculous for the Congress to spend more money in peacetime than it takes in; but under our present system of constitutional government we could have recurring deficits from now until doomsday so far as any restraint upon ourselves is contained in constitutional limitations. As I stated, briefly, the amendment provides that when Congress appropriates in peacetime more than it takes in, the President is authorized to reduce all appropriations by uniform percentages until the budget comes into balance. For example, if Congress should create a deficit of 2 percent in excess of its income, every appropriation would be reduced 2 percent. It would not hurt anything. Probably we would all get along just as well with a 2 or 3 percent reduction as we would on the entire amount.

The Government would then be operated just as a business is operated. If a business does not have the money to pay for something, it does not appropriate it. If the money were not available, the Congress would not appropriate it; or, if Congress were to overappropriate, the President would say, "We have not the money; therefore I am going to reduce the appropriations to the point where we have it."

I have corresponded with the economists of such concerns as General Motors, who have devoted a great deal of thought to the problem of economics and finance in their businesses. I have corresponded with eminent members of the judiciary. I have corresponded with teachers of economics. While I would not want to say that the amendment which I have proposed is perfect in all respects, it would be such a great improvement over the existing situation that even in its introduced form it would be a great step forward if it could be adopted. I have introduced it for the past 5 years and more. I have written articles about it in the Saturday Evening Post, and have received thousands of letters of commendation. I have made six or eight

speeches on the floor of the Senate, and I have heard no one say a word against it. It has been considered by the Appropriations Committee, which reported it to the Senate without recommendation, except that it go to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration.

Everyone deplores these annual deficits. Everyone knows that they are bad for the country. Yet here is a piece of legislation which would deal with the question; and it is difficult to obtain consideration of it and get it to the floor of the Senate.

The eminent Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], when he was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, joined with me in proposing this amendment. Both of us have spoken upon the subject, and we have appeared before numerous citizens' organizations all over the country. No one seems to be against it, but somehow or other in every session of Congress we have from a dozen to 50 speeches deploring annual deficits, and no one does anything about it. I have done something about it, and I sincerely hope that the Committee on the Judiciary may do something about it.

Let me say in support of the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin that if he will study the financing of the Italian Government from the time Garibaldi joined the eight independent republics together until the advent of Mussolini, a period of 66 years, I believe, he will find that for 44 of the 66 years, or two-thirds of the time after the day of Garibaldi, the Italian Government lived on borrowed money. For 44 of the 66 years of its existence it spent more than it took in.

One of the reasons Mussolini was called to power, one of the reasons why there were barricades in the streets and industrial unrest, fear, and uncertainty was that two-thirds of the time the Italian Government existed it lived upon the future. When borrowing became more difficult the people found that in proportion to their wealth they were the most heavily taxed people on the face of the earth. So, rebelling at last against the results of their own parliamentary indifference, mobs rioted, and Mussolini, a dictator, came upon the scene.

I shall not transgress upon the time of the Senate to speak of a similar situation, in varying form, under Hitler. History abundantly proves that one of the greatest contributing factors to the rise of Mussolini and Hitler was the policy of deficit spending practiced by the Italian and German Governments, which finally brought dictatorship on the people.

I am hopeful that the Committee on the Judiciary will give serious study to this amendment. If it will do so and eliminate any "bugs" in it and bring it before the Senate for consideration, I think that committee will have rendered a real service to the perpetuation of the democracy we love, the freedom we enjoy, and the free enterprise we want to keep.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to have confirmation from the distinguished Senator from Maryland of some of the statements I have made. I assure him that at the next meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary I shall speak to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the chairman of the committee, and see if a subcommittee cannot be appointed, if one has not already been appointed. After the persistent efforts of the Senator from Maryland, I feel that it is time to have hearings, and that the whole subject should be properly aired before the American people so that they can not only see the wisdom of the amendment, but also the wisdom of safeguarding the Nation's economy.

There is just one other subject about which I wish to speak very briefly at this time. I have had a great deal of correspondence from people asking why we do not send representatives to Spain. Today I took occasion to look into the subject. I find that back in 1946 there was a General Assembly resolution regarding relations between Spain and the members of the United Nations. In that resolution the General Assembly recommended that the Franco Government be barred from membership in international agencies established by or brought into relationship with the United Nations, and that members recall their ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary from Madrid. That, apparently, we did.

In view of the world situation, and in view of Spain's strategic importance and resources, I ask whether it would not be best for the United States to send an ambassador, or to take the lead in the United Nations in an effort to bring about more harmonious relations.

We have taken the position that it is not our function to go into other countries and change their form of government. Many people feel that Franco should go. Many others feel that he should remain. We have found, as I have illustrated by quoting from Walter Lippmann's article, that when we do such things we make a failure of it, as exemplified by our conduct in a number of places on the globe since the termination of the war. We know that mere withdrawal of ambassadors has been too weak an instrument to force the modification of the Franco regime. We know that Spain is one of the strongest anti-Communist countries. It seems to me that it should be allied with the rest of the western world in the struggle against communism.

Mr. President, we are engaged in a great international poker game. We are in the United Nations; we are going to engage in the North Atlantic Pact; we are going to send money to the European countries to strengthen their economy so that once more there will be, not an iron curtain, but a human curtain between us and any aggressor. The question of whether Spain should continue to be excluded from the United Nations because she is a dictatorship is, of course, something which the United Nations will have to determine. However, it should be pointed out that a number of the present members of the United Nations have a dictatorship form of government, as all of us know. Despite the resolution, the Latin-American countries already have sent their ambassadors to Spain; so, in the interest of Western Hemispheric solidarity, I ask whether we should not follow suit.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time because I am sure that the initiatory steps must be taken by the President and the State Department. Of course, Spain does not like the treatment we have given her. We maintain an ambassador in Moscow, and in all the satellite countries we have ambassadors. So is there any reason why we should not send an ambassador to Madrid?

I trust that these interrogatories will immediately come to the attention of the State Department, and the next time any representative of the State Department appears before the Foreign Relations Committee I hope I shall be able to get the answers.

Again I say, Mr. President, that we are living in a very small world. Apparently we cannot choose all the players with whom we are engaged in the international poker game, but the ones we do choose we select with our eyes open, with the idea of having them prove of value to us in case of any international emergency.

Mr. President, in view of all the circumstances of today—not of 4, 5, or 6 years ago, but in view of the present situation—it seems to me that it is imperatively necessary that this entire situation be reviewed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Ives	Murray
Bridges	Jenner	Myers
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kefauver	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Stennis
Ferguson	McCarran	Taft
Flanders	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
George	McFarland	Thye
Green	McKellar	Tydings
Gurney	McMahon	Wherry
Hayden	Magnuson	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Miller	Withers
Hill	Millikin	
Hoey	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

HEARINGS BEFORE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE—MEMBERS EXCUSED FROM SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations, which, tomorrow, begins hearings on the North Atlantic Pact, may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until further notice, and that on quorum calls, there may be made a statement, at the end of the quorum calls, to the effect that the Committee on Foreign Relations has been excused because of hearings, so as to protect the members of that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1705) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill which I have just introduced amends the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 in two important respects.

First, the bill provides for an increase in the number of displaced persons to be admitted into the United States from 205,000 in 2 years to 507,000 in 4 years.

Second, the bill authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances, not to exceed $5,000,000, to be used for loans to public or private agencies to finance the inspection and transportation of persons admitted from ports of entry within the United States to places of final destination; the purpose of this second provision being to further assure a general distribution of the displaced persons over the United States, particularly to the rural areas.

What is the justification, Mr. President, for increasing the number of displaced persons to be admitted to 507,000, a number which exceeds the number provided for in any bill thus far introduced?

What is the justification, when we know of the tremendous and ever increasing influx of people into the United States; when we know, for example, that during the course of the last year there was a general migration into the United States from Puerto Rico, with a net gain to this country of approximately 116,000 Puerto Ricans who, because of their citizenship status, may enter without limit? What is the justification, Mr. President, when we know that during the course of the last year, over 200,000 illegal entrants were returned across our borders to adjoining countries? What is the justification, when we know that the records of the immigration and naturalization service shows an arrearage of thousands upon thousands of cases for investigation and that estimates of the total number of illegal aliens in this country run from one to five million persons? What is the justification, when we know that the deportations or forced departures from the United States for the last 5 years have exceeded the number of immigrants entering the country legally during that time, notwithstanding the tremendous increase in legal immigration? What is the justification, Mr. President, when the statistics reveal that during the last fiscal year approximately 500,000 persons were admitted to the United States on a temporary basis as technical visitors, many of whom do everything possible to remain indefinitely in the United States? What is the justification when we know that in just one district alone, there is a backlog of over 20,000 overstayed visitors?

What is the justification for increasing the number to be admitted under the present law to 507,000 when, during the Nazi regime, some 250,000 refugees were admitted into the United States under our quota laws for permanent residence and some 200,000 were admitted temporarily, many of whom still remain in this country in an illegal status? What is the justification, Mr. President, when the United States has, in addition, pursuant to a presidential directive in 1945, admitted an additional 40,000 displaced persons, and has provided, by the present law, for an additional 205,000 displaced persons? What is the justification, when the statistics reveal that a disproportionate number of persons who have been and are being admitted into the United States are settling in the congested metropolitan areas where the housing shortage is most acute? What is the justification, when the statistics of the United States Department of Labor reveal that unemployment in this country is steadily mounting and that unemployment is approximately 600,000 higher than a year ago, and when we know the inevitable impact on our employment situation by the eventual curtailment of our foreign aid program?

The justification, Mr. President, is simply this, that 507,000 will not be a drop in the bucket compared to the number who will be admitted into this country, if we follow the route of the proposals which are currently pending in the Congress to expand the category of eligible displaced persons from the group presently embraced, namely, the war-displaced persons, to include refugees and displaced persons irrespective of considerations of time or geographical area.

The present displaced-persons law, Mr. President, was designed to afford a measure of relief, consistent with the best interests of the United States, to those persons who were displaced by the war, or shortly thereafter. The war in Europe ended on May 8, 1945, at which time the United States and other occupying powers in Germany and Austria became the guardians of those persons who had been displaced by the war and who could not return to their homelands. This group, which may be designated as the war-displaced persons, are embraced in the present law which has a cut-off day for eligibility on December 22, 1945, a date which is some 7 months after the conclusion of the war. Beginning some year or two thereafter, and continuing up to the present time, because of the chaotic condition of the world, tens of millions of persons have been and are being displaced all over the world.

Under the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, the term "displaced person" includes not just a person who was displaced by the war, but any person who, at any time, now or in the future, is displaced. The fact is—and I know concerning what I speak, for I have, within the course of the last several months, studied this entire subject exhaustively—that the displaced person and the refugee situation is of staggering proportions, and involves millions upon millions of people all over the world whose ranks are constantly being swelled.

As every Senator knows, the pressure which is currently being brought to bear to open the floodgates of our country, is terrific. The records on file with the Congress pursuant to the Lobbying Registration Act show, for example, that just one pressure group on displaced-persons legislation has to date paid out over $800,000. Where has this money been spent? Aside from the actual buttonholing of Senators and Representatives by high-pressure lobbyists, there has been disseminated over the length and breadth of this Nation a campaign of misrepresentation and falsehood which has misled many public-spirited and well-meaning citizens and organizations.

Just a few days ago, for example, I received a letter from an official of one of these organizations protesting a resolution passed by the organization, advocating changes in the displaced-persons law. This official protested that not a single member of the organization had read a single word in either the present law or in the proposals, and knew nothing of the facts except as presented by one of these propaganda organizations.

The objective of this campaign is to ever widen the scope of the displaced-persons program of the United States and the numbers to be admitted. This campaign has already been reflected in the halls of the Congress by the various proposals thus far submitted. Bills are pending, Mr. President, which start us on the road to tearing down the immigration barriers of this Nation for the admission of millions of refugees and displaced persons from all over the world. We hear the plea of the some 700,000 refugees in the Greek civil war, of some 10,000,000 refugees in India, of millions in China, of some 700,000 Arabs displaced in the Palestine war, of tens of millions in eastern Europe who have not yet joined the ranks. The International Refugee Organization, in the occupied areas of Europe alone, is currently receiving applications at the rate of 20,000 a month and is taking on the rolls some 8,000 persons per month. Recently, upon the reactivation of the regular immigration quotas of Germany and Austria, there was an immediate registration of some 400,000 persons who are now on the waiting list.

Mr. President, the present law has been falsely criticized as being unjust and discriminatory. Wherein lie the injustices and the discriminations? Although it is charged that the present law discriminates against certain religious groups, official spokesmen for some of these groups have denied that the law discriminates against them. Moreover, the facts immediately dispel this charge.

It is charged that the present law discriminates against persons of the Jewish or Catholic faith. As of March 31, of this year, 44 percent of the displaced persons who have been admitted pursuant to the act have been of the Catholic faith. Thirty-nine percent of the persons admitted pursuant to the act have been of the Jewish faith. Eight and one-half percent of the persons admitted pursuant to the act have been of the Protestant faith, and 8½ percent have been of the Greek Orthodox faith.

It is charged that the present law, which requires assurances of housing and

jobs as a prerequisite to admission, is administratively unworkable. The Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission, however, when recently testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, stated that, although the program under the present law did not get under way until October 1948, there are already on file assurances of an aggregate number of 143,000 people. I quote his testimony:

> We have no trouble in getting enough assurances. * * * So far as assurances are concerned, we shall receive many more than 205,000, many more. They are coming in at that terrific rate.

He further testified to the effect that, notwithstanding the lag in getting the program under way, by the summer months, the flow will be at a rate of 16,000 persons a month, and that the aggregate number provided for under the present law will arrive in the United States within a period of 19 months, instead of within a period of 24 months, as provided in the present law.

The present law has also been unjustly criticized as unfair because it gives a priority of 30 percent to agriculturalists and their families. The facts are, however, that this priority is not only eminently fair to the displaced persons but its justified by the need for agricultural workers in the United States and the desire to direct the displaced persons away from the congested metropolitan areas.

The number of displaced persons within the classification for which a 30-percent priority is given constitutes at least 60 percent of the total of the displaced persons. It is thus seen that a 30-percent priority to agriculturalists and their families is eminently fair. The experience under the present law amply vindicates this provision, for, notwithstanding the present law, over 80 percent of the displaced persons who have thus far been admitted have settled in metropolitan areas.

Another provision of the present law which has been criticized unjustly is that provision which gives a 40-percent priority to persons who have fled from those countries which are now de facto annexed by Communist Russia and who cannot possibly return for fear of their very lives. Here again, Mr. President, at least 40 percent of the displaced persons, by number, are actually in this category of persons for whom the priority has been given, but less than 40 percent of the displaced persons thus far admitted have been persons covered by the priority.

What will be the operative effect of the bill which I have introduced? At the present time it is estimated that there are a little over 500,000 war-displaced persons in the occupied areas of Europe who would be potentially eligible under the terms of the present law. The present law provides for the admission of approximately half this number into the United States. The net effect of the bill, then, is to embrace virtually all displaced persons who were displaced by the war, or shortly thereafter, who are potentially eligible under the present law.

I solemnly warn the Senate that, notwithstanding the humanitarian implications of the entire problem of refugees and displaced persons, if we expand the category of eligible displaced persons to include not only war-displaced persons but also refugees and displaced persons irrespective of considerations of time or geographical area, every session of the Congress, from now until decades to come, will see an ever-increasing influx into this country of millions and millions. It is high time, Mr. President, if it is not already too late, for us to give at least a passing thought to the best interests of the United States of America.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has brought out one of the most disturbing aspects of this situation: the unbelievable pressure which has been brought to bear upon Members of Congress by lobbyists and self-appointed pressure groups.

The hundreds of thousands of dollars which have been spent in stirring up unwarranted discontent against the displaced persons law would, if used for that purpose, have been sufficient to give adequate relief and care to thousands of displaced persons whom the selfsame pressure organizations profess to support. The Senator from Nevada has made specific reference to one organization which has spent over $800,000 in approximately 2 years. This organization is the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. It is a curious thing that whenever any organization desires to push for any sort of special legislation, it will invariably cloak itself behind the high-sounding phrase "citizens committee." From a study of the financial statements submitted by this pressure front, it would appear that a substantial part of this money was actually contributed by only a handful of persons in amounts of $500 or more.

I invite the Members of the Senate to study the statements of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons which are filed with the clerk of the House under the Lobbying Registration Act. They will find there the names of the contributors and the items for which this money has been spent. A large portion of the money has been spent for items concerned in promotion and publicity. Many thousands of dollars are listed for such items as literary services, mimeographing expenses, publicity expenses, publicity services and expenses. For example, the report for the first quarter of 1948, which I hold in my hand, lists 18 items under the heading "Literary services," and approximately 75 items under the heading "Publicity services." These items alone run into many thousands of dollars for one quarter of the year. The total expenses listed for that quarter amount to $149,507.96.

Mr. President, it is not difficult for us to conclude into what channels of publicity and pressure these moneys have been spent. All of us are aware of the tremendous flood of propaganda material which has poured into every office of every Member of Congress. We have all been buttonholed by the untold numbers of lobbyists who are determined that we shall bring about the complete breakdown of our immigration system. To this end, there has been expended an additional sum of tens of thousands of dollars for traveling expense. The statement for the first quarter, which I have here, lists $32,734.33 for travel expense. The figures in the other reports are comparable in relation to total expenses.

The money which is spent by this organization is undoubtedly responsible for most of the vituperative attacks made upon any Member of Congress who refuses to be swayed by indiscriminate charges of discrimination. It appears to be the belief of the sponsors of this pressure group, and the others like it, that they can stampede the Congress into adopting any sort of legislation they happen to propose, by spending thousands of dollars for propaganda, by raising a pitiful howl about imaginary discriminations contained in this legislation. Let me say that the present displaced persons law has in it no clause, no provisions which in any way discriminates against any group anywhere.

For centuries our country has been the haven of the persecuted masses of the world. They have enjoyed here new freedoms and new hopes. There has never been any attempt to discriminate against peoples because of their race or creed. The fact that millions of people are still anxious to come here is eloquent evidence of my contention. If Senators will review the history of our great country, they will immediately be impressed by the fact that persons from all parts of the globe and of all religious beliefs have come here to settle—the Quakers of Pennsylvania the Catholics of Maryland, the Puritans of New England, and all the other creeds to which people have adhered.

I submit, Mr. President, that these pressure organizations would perform a more humanitarian service if they took their thousands of dollars in slush funds and used it for the relief of the unfortunate people of Europe; reserving, perhaps, a small portion of it to report to the world that this land of ours stands as the last great stronghold of religious, personal, and civil liberties.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Brewster	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Bricker	Hill	McGrath
Bridges	Hoey	McKellar
Cain	Holland	McMahon
Capehart	Humphrey	Magnuson
Chavez	Ives	Maybank
Cordon	Jenner	Miller
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Ecton	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Ellender	Kefauver	Myers
Ferguson	Kem	Neely
George	Kerr	Pepper
Gillette	Long	Reed
Green	McCarthy	Robertson

Russell	Stennis	Wherry
Saltonstall	Taft	Wiley
Schoeppel	Thomas, Utah	Young
Sparkman	Thye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, in line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics," on page 4, line 8, after "(5, U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$5,450,000" and insert "$5,506,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Wage and Hour Division," on page 4, line 21, after "(41 U. S. C. 38)", to strike out "and for the functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act transferred by Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1946"; and on page 5, line 4, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$5,361,000" and insert "$5,252,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency-American Printing House for the Blind," on page 6, line 12, after the figures "$115,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used for the printing of large-type, ink-print books."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope this proviso will not remain in the bill. I am a member of the committee, and I say very frankly that I did not object to this proviso when the bill was being considered by the committee, but since then I have received evidence from my home State, from the superintendent of the Perkins Institution, from the Massachusetts School for the Blind, and from other authorities, who express the hope that this proviso will be stricken from the bill. I believe the committee heard only one side of this case, and did not realize that there is very serious objection to the proviso.

Since 1879, the Congress has appropriated annually for the education of the blind. In 1879, as I understand the matter, a nonprofit institution called the American Printing House was organized in Louisville, Ky. It was established to print books in braille and to print other reading material for the education of blind students. The output of the American Printing House was available to schools for the legally blind in the various States of the Union. The products of that company were not available except to schools where legally blind students were being educated.

About 10 or 12 years ago those schools also began to educate children having only a little sight. Such children are still "legally blind," and have to be educated as legally blind students. As I understand the matter, it was found that such students could be educated more quickly and better by the use of books printed in a different kind of type, type of very large size. So the American Printing House undertook to print books with that special type, for the education of legally blind students who had just a little sight, and it made those books available to such institutions.

More recently, as I understand the matter, a commercial printing house has taken up this type of printing. Of course, we do not wish to have the Government compete with private business in the field of printing or in any other field of business, but we wish to make this Federal appropriation available as far as possible for the education of the blind.

I understand that if this proviso remains in the bill, and eventually is enacted into law, the American Printing House, which has set up printing machines for the purpose mentioned, will not be able to use those machines, which are available for the printing of such books in large type.

Furthermore, I am informed by the superintendent of Perkins Institution, in Massachusetts, that this type of education will have to be given up by it if this proviso remains in the bill, because in that case there will not be sufficient money to permit the purchase at commercial rates of books printed in such large type. For instance, the superintendent of Perkins Institution gives as an example an English dictionary which, so he tells me, will cost $35 when purchased by such an institution, if this proviso is enacted into law.

So, Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I hope this proviso will be stricken from the bill. I, for one, in the committee, voted on it under a misapprehension.

Mr. HILL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. IVES, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to say that I concur heartily in all the Senator from Massachusetts has said, joining with him in urging the Senate to vote down the proviso embodied in the committee amendment. I wish to emphasize the fact, which the Senator has mentioned, that if the proviso is stricken out the funds appropriated by the Congress will go as they have gone for the past 70 years, to purchase only the large-print books or tangible apparatus for children who are in institutions for the blind in the several States.

I have a letter, addressed to me under date of April 22, by Mr. F. E. Davis, superintendent of the American Printing House for the Blind, the house to which the Senator from Massachusetts referred, to which the appropriation goes for allocations to blind children in the State institutions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The American Printing House for the Blind is a nonprofit institution, is it not?

Mr. HILL. It is absolutely a nonprofit institution. As the Senator has said, the funds go to make the allocations of braille books and tangible apparatus for children in State institutions for the blind. Mr. Davis, writing to me under date of April 22, says:

> Large-print books have come to be considered absolutely necessary for certain peoples classed as blind enrolled in the schools and classes for the blind. In response to a unanimous demand from superintendents of schools for the blind throughout the Nation, it is the purpose of the American Printing House to use these funds for the benefit of these schools in exactly the same way as such funds have always been used in supplying these schools with Braille books and tangible apparatus.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 22, 1949.*

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: Referring to my talk with you today I am writing this to make all together clear the fact that out of the funds carried in the pending Federal Security appropriation bill (H. R. 3333) for the American Printing House for the Blind, no part of such funds will be used for the purpose of subsidizing the making of any large-print books furnished to agencies or persons other than the duly authorized schools and classes for the blind. In addition to local audits our books are annually audited by the Federal Social Security Agency to see that funds are expended in accordance with the Federal law.

The American Printing House has been and is a nonprofit institution and any books or apparatus which may be furnished to any sources are on a nonprofit basis. The trustees serve without compensation and wholly for the public good.

I believe you have seen a copy of my letter to Senator CHAPMAN of yesterday, dealing with the proviso in the pending appropriation bill, and this may be considered supplemental to that letter.

Large-print books have come to be considered absolutely necessary for certain peoples classed as blind enrolled in the schools and classes for the blind. In response to a unanimous demand of superintendents of schools for the blind throughout the Nation, it is the purpose of the American Printing House to use these funds for the benefit of these schools in exactly the same way as such funds have always been used in supplying these schools with braille books and tangible apparatus.

I should like to reiterate the statement that if the proviso is permitted to stand, the effect will be to deny a particular group of pupils classed as blind from any benefit from these appropriation funds with the result that if such children are to be supplied with large-print books, the States and Territories will have to purchase them with local funds; whereas, without the proviso they would be allocated in a per capita way to all the schools for the blind and paid for out of these annual appropriations.

I regret that the trustees of the American Printing House had no knowledge that the Senate Appropriations Committee was considering the subject under discussion; else the Printing House would have requested the right to be heard before action on the proviso was taken. If there is any other information you desire, I shall be happy to supply it. I remain,

Respectfully yours,

F. E. DAVIS,
Superintendent, American Printing House for the Blind.

Mr. IVES and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Just a moment. Mr. President, I am handling this bill on the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not mean to usurp the Senator's function. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is all right, but I also should like to have something to say about this proviso, for which both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Alabama voted in committee. I have no objection to the language of the amendment being changed, because I, too, want to do for the blind the things the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Massachusetts are trying to do. This amendment was written by the committee, which included the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Alabama, and was especially dedicated to Senators on the other side of the aisle. The only thing the committee had in mind was to have the Government subsidy used, or efforts made to have it used, so it would not bring about competition with private industry. That is all there is to it. There was not a single member of the committee, including the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Massachusetts, who did not vote for the amendment as proposed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall yield in a moment. I have no objection to the proviso language being eliminated, but I insist that Senators who so readily voted in committee for it should at least allow the chairman to explain to the Senate why the proviso was included in the bill and, to state that it was approved by the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Massachusetts. If Senators change their minds later, as the result of a misunderstanding which may have occurred in committee, that is all right, but it is not the purpose of the chairman of the subcommittee to take the blame for the insertion of this language in the bill by the committee, and then have somebody else defend the blind.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Pardon me. We hear every day in the week, and we have heard today, about the Government engaging in business, about the Government interfering with local authorities, about the Government doing this and the Government doing that. All the committee was trying to do was to see to it that the subsidy which has been used so well for the blind, be continued in its effective use.

I may say that from 1879 until a year or two ago, this money was used for the blind, not for the near blind, or for those who think they may be blind, but for those who are actually blind. The committee was merely trying to protect them in the use of the money. However, inasmuch as we have the assurance of the Senator from Alabama that the printing house makes proper use of the money—and, incidentally, I was listening to the Senator from Alabama, and we may be sure the Senator was correct, that it would not be used for private purposes—I have no objection whatever to the elimination of the proviso; but I did want the Senate to understand that it was not the chairman of the subcommittee who was responsible. The other Senators are just as responsible for the proviso as I am.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the able Senator from New Mexico is correct in his explanation as to how the proviso came to be in the bill. The proviso was placed in the bill by the committee on the theory that otherwise there might be competition with private enterprise. Since that time, additional information has come to the able Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Alabama, and the Senator from Michigan. For example, when I learned from people in my State that there was an objection to the proviso, I wrote them asking for a full explanation. When I received a letter, which I now should like to put into the RECORD, I changed my mind entirely on the matter. I think other members of the committee have changed their minds. The letter contains a better explanation than any I could possibly make on the floor as to why I changed my mind between the time the committee acted and the time the bill reached the floor. I ask that the letter be included in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHIGAN SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND,
Lansing, Mich., April 25, 1949.

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: Thank you for your reply to my letter and telegram. Following is the information you desire:

According to our State law, children of Michigan between the ages of 7 and 19 who have eye defects so severe that they cannot obtain an education in the regular public schools are eligible to come to the Michigan School for the Blind.

You can see that with this broad interpretation there are many children at this school who are not totally blind but who have enough usable vision to read large-print books. According to our eye specialist many of these children will retain what vision they have and consequently it would be unfair to require them to read and write braille. If these children have enough usable vision so they need not study braille but who have not enough vision to read the print used in the regular public-school textbooks, the only answer is textbooks printed in large type.

Because of the increase in the number of visually handicapped children in Michigan, and the shortage of teachers in this field, the State School for the Blind here in Lansing is expected to provide an education for these children.

With our limited budget and the tremendous cost of large-print books, it would be of immeasurable help if these books could be printed at the American Printing House for the Blind in Louisville, Ky.

I sincerely hope that you will use your influence to have this objectionable clause deleted from the present Senate bill.

Respectfully yours,

W. J. FINCH,
Superintendent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should merely like to say that I, too, have heard from representatives of schools and other persons in the State of Minnesota. I have here a telegram from J. C. Lysen, superintendent of the Minnesota Braille and Sight Saving School, Faribault, Minn., in which he asks for the elimination of the proviso that "none of these funds shall be used for the printing of large-type, ink-print books." I know that members of the committee have already concurred in this view, and I am of the opinion that the Senate will vote down the amendment; I certainly hope so. I think we should remember that this was nothing more nor less than one of those things that happen through what may be called an oversight or misjudgment, in view of certain evidence which was presented. Other evidence which has come at this late hour indicates that the proviso should be eliminated, and that we should continue the same procedure as that which has been followed for many years under our program of aid to the blind. I ask that the telegram, together with a follow-up letter dated April 19, 1949, by Mr. Lysen, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARIBAULT, MINN., *April 19, 1949.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY:

Regarding Department of Labor—Federal Security Appropriation Bill for 1950 Committee has put following limitation: "*Provided,* None of these funds are used to produce large-print books." This would knock out textbooks for approximately one-half of our schools where we have partially sighted children. Would you please use your influence in striking out this limiting clause. Letter follows.

J. C. LYSEN,
Superintendent, Minnesota Braille and Sight Saving School.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
MINNESOTA BRAILLE AND
SIGHT SAVING SCHOOL,
Faribault, April 19, 1949.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This letter is a follow-up to the telegram, which was sent you today. In this telegram, I mentioned the fact that the Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation carries a limiting clause, as follows: "*Provided,* None of these funds are used for producing large-print books."

It is my feeling that this clause would not have gotten in there, unless there has possibly been some lobbying on the part of commercial book publishers. Our books are produced at the American Printing House for

the Blind, at Louisville, Ky. Our printing house is now launched on a magnificent program of producing sight-saving books, with large enough type, to be used by children with defective vision, but who are not blind.

The present program of large-type books at Louisville was started several years ago, and I believe that I was one of the chief instigators of the program.

If, therefore, you can knock out this limiting clause, in the above-mentioned bill, I would appreciate it greatly. Please let me hear from you, as to whether or not you succeed.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. LYSEN,
Superintendent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say merely that what the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico, has said, is absolutely correct. So far as I am concerned, speaking as one Senator, I voted for the proviso with the idea of trying to stimulate competition. Later I received information which obviously caused me to change my mind.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I merely wish to observe that I do not think anybody is to blame for the situation which has arisen. I believe the committee acted in absolute good faith, on the basis of the evidence before the committee at the time. Evidence which has since come to us is very compelling. I have in my hand telegrams from two institutions in the State of New York, nonprofit institutions, begging that the proviso be stricken from the bill. Therefore, I take practically the same position as that taken by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I want to associate myself with what has been said by other members of the Appropriations Committee. I probably voted for the amendment, too, at the time, because of a general understanding that it possibly was subsidizing an institution that is in competition with private enterprise. The committee did not then have all the facts before it. I do not think it is a reflection upon any member of the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, or any other Senator that after having ascertained the truth about what the real situation is we should all agree that the proviso should be stricken from the bill, because every dollar involved, as I am informed and believe, actually goes to help some child who is so nearly blind that this service is required to enable him to become educated other than by the braille system. Therefore, Mr. President, if I voted for the amendment in committee, I am willing to change my position at this time so that we may do what we should do and continue this service to the blind and nearly blind children of the Nation.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky. He has been waiting a long time.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, since the statement has been made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, that the amendment was adopted in committee under a misunderstanding or misapprehension, and since he has stated to the Senate that he will accept the amendment which is being discussed, I see no need for further discussion.

Since the American Printing House for the Blind was established many years ago, it has always been a nonprofit institution. The adoption of the amendment would have had a very serious effect, because it would mean the deprivation of thousands of children with a vision of 20/200 or less, who come within the accepted definition of blind persons, although they can see daylight. In former years another system was followed by educators of the blind, but during the past 15 years, as I understand, the best authorities on schools for the blind have reached the conclusion that children who are not absolutely blind, but who can be said to be legally blind, can be best taught by the use of large-print books. Since there is no profit accruing to anyone involved, and since it is a humanitarian work carried on by the institution, I am glad the Senator from New Mexico has stated that he will accept the amendment. I hope it will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks relating to the American Printing House for the Blind, there may be inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of April 21, 1949, by Mr. F. E. Davis, superintendent of the American Printing House for the Blind.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE
FOR THE BLIND,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1949.

Hon. VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAPMAN: You have requested that I furnish you a statement as to the effect of the proviso reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee in H. R. 3333 as to the item of $115,000 for the use of the American Printing House for the Blind during the ensuing fiscal year. This I am very glad to do.

The primary work of the American Printing House for the Blind is the extension of its services to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal act to promote the education of the blind. This act, originally passed in 1879, and now authorizing an appropriation to the printing house up to $125,000 a year, is designed to furnish this institution with the funds to provide the free school texts, tangible apparatus, and other supplementary materials necessary to the education of the pupils under instruction in the public educational institutions for the blind throughout the country. Unfortunately, in many of the States, little or no local funds are available for educational materials for the blind, and the schools for the blind must depend solely on the printing house to obtain them.

The American Printing House for the Blind was originally chartered by the Commonwealth of Kentucky on January 23, 1858, as a national, nonprofit institution designed to manufacture and provide at cost books and tangible apparatus for the schools for blind.

For 20 years after its incorporation, the printing house supplied its materials on a cash basis through funds raised in the several States. In 1878 the American Association of Instructors of the Blind memorialized Congress for an appropriation to provide a more adequate and permanent source of funds for books and instructional materials for all the schools. As a result in 1879 Congress passed the act "To promote the education of the blind." Since that time the full appropriation from the Federal Government has been used to provide books and tangible apparatus for the education of the blind in the various States on a nonprofit basis. No Federal funds have been used to provide buildings or other facilities at the printing house. The Commonwealth of Kentucky and contributions from interested citizens all over the country have provided funds for the construction of needed buildings and quarters for the printing house operation through the many years of its existence.

In its role as the official schoolbook printery for the blind of the United States and its Territories, the expansion of the services of the printing house has been closely correlated with the historical development of educational methods and curricula in the schools and classes for the blind. In the beginning, books were published in a multiplicity of embossed types, since it was not until 1918 that a single embossed system was adopted in this country. When a more highly contracted system of braille was adopted in 1932, the printing house began printing books in this system. During the thirties the Talking Book—books on phonograph records—was developed, and the printing house established a department for the manufacture of this type of literature. For approximately the past 15 years, there has been a growing sentiment in the schools for the blind that many of the partially blind children under their instruction, whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness, might better be taught by the use of large-print books than braille. For this class of children, totaling between 25 and 30 percent of the blind school population, the printing house has therefore recently undertaken the manufacture of school texts in large print, with a view to supplying parallel braille and large-type editions of educational materials, so that both the blind and partially visioned children in our schools for the blind might be taught within the same classroom.

The American Printing House for the Blind has been a pioneer in dealing with the subject of large-type printing.

The establishment of a department for the printing of large-type materials for the schools and classes for the blind has been under consideration by the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind for the last 12 years. As early as 1936, the printing house actually published a single large-type book—Everyday Manners for American Boys and Girls—which was distributed gratis through the gift of a private benefactor. The first book was published in an effort to determine the technical problems in the manufacture of this type of book and just how well the printing house was equipped to do the job. Although the printing of the book was a success it was not felt at that time that the schools for the blind had their sight-saving programs sufficiently well developed to justify the immediate establishment of such a department at the printing house with a view to adding this type of publication to the services provided through the Federal appropriation "To promote the education of the blind." In the years immediately following, the establish-

ment of our talking book department, and the expansion of our braille printing and tangible apparatus departments crowded the facilities of our plant to capacity, and little active thought could be given to the large-type project.

In 1944, sentiment in favor of establishing sight-saving departments in our residential schools for the blind had developed to such a point that the Little Rock convention of the American Association of Instructors of the Blind passed a resolution requesting the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind to make a study of means whereby textbooks in suitable type might be made available to the residential schools for the blind and the public school braille classes which the printing house now provides with embossed textbooks. In the same resolution, the printing house was requested to give consideration "to the possibility of making these textbooks available to sight-saving classes in public schools provided that this should not be done by the use of money now designated to provide embossed books for the blind, appliances, etc., but either by new appropriations, the use of revolving funds, or through gifts and legacies."

In October 1945 the printing house sent questionnaires to the 53 residential schools for the blind requesting information concerning the number of pupils who could use sight-saving materials. For this purpose, the following popularly used definition of blindness was employed: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting glasses, or a peripheral field so contracted that the widest diameter of such field subtends an angular distance no greater than 20 degrees. Responses to the questionnaire were received from 90 percent of the schools canvassed. The replies received showed that, of the total school population, approximately 27 percent met not only the legal definition of blindness, but had eye conditions which would profit more from the use of suitable large-type books than from braille. In the light of these facts, the general counsel of the Federal Security Agency ruled in 1946 that the act of 1879 to promote the education of the blind includes large-print books designed for the education of the blind. It was further ruled that, for administrative purposes, the above-quoted definition of blindness should be used.

It is the purpose of the printing house to supply large-type materials out of the Federal appropriations solely for the benefit of children who come within the legal definition of blindness—and to no one else. When taking the registration of the blind school population on the first Monday in January of each year, in order to determine the quota allocation of credit for the individual schools on a per capita basis, it is permitted that only those pupils whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness be registered. Further, books and materials in large type are supplied to the schools only in quantities comparable to the registration of their blind pupils. For instance, such materials are not supplied to sight-saving classes whose children are not legally blind and who cannot be registered with the printing house for the Federal appropriation. However, as a private, nonprofit institution for the blind, chartered by the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the printing house may supply any or all of its publications or manufactures for cash to any person or institution, provided the price charged represents only the cost of manufacture plus a reasonable overhead—absolutely no profit.

The passage of the act of 1879 "To promote the education of the blind" was the result of a memorial to Congress by the schools for the blind. In order to safeguard the expenditure of the Federal funds, the act provided that all superintendents of schools for the blind shall be ex officio trustees of the printing house, and shall exercise complete control, as agents of the Federal Government, in the choice of the materials, and the style and type of their manufacture, which are supplied to their institutions out of the Federal appropriation. The Federal act further stipulated that all materials supplied out of these funds must be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Therefore, if the printing house is not to be permitted to supply large-type materials to the schools and classes for the blind out of the Federal appropriation, then the original intent and purpose of the act will be denied, since the schools have definitely indicated a great need and desire for this type of literature to be supplied to them by the printing house.

In summarizing the reasons for omission of the limiting clause from the present Senate appropriation bill, the following points should be noted:

1. It is the purpose of the act of 1879 "To promote the education of the blind," to provide all types of literature and tangible apparatus as are needed in the education of blind students in the public educational institutions for the blind in this country, and which can be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Any limitations of the above would deny the original intent of the act.

2. Materials supplied by the printing house to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal appropriation are designed solely for the use of children who come within the legal definition of blindness. Only those children can be registered to receive benefit from the act, and books can be supplied through the Federal funds for them only, although other children of greater vision may be enrolled in the same educational institutions.

3. The provision of large-type materials is needed for approximately 25 to 30 percent of the blind school population who are legally blind. Most schools have limited or no funds for the purchase of large-type materials for cash. If the printing house cannot supply these materials to them out of the Federal funds, then this group of children will be denied the best materials for their education.

4. The American Printing House for the Blind is a private, nonprofit institution engaged solely in the manufacture of literature and tangible apparatus for the blind, and is no way concerned with commercial enterprises. It is not felt that publication of materials for the visually handicapped is feasible commercially, because of high costs of production with relatively small unit distributions of each item. (The present total blind school population is between 5,000 and 6,000 children ranging in age from kindergarten through the high school.

5. The limiting proviso providing that none of the Federal appropriation can be used for producing large print books will not in any way prevent the American Printing House for the Blind from making available large-print books on a nonprofit basis, but it will prevent the children with 20/200 vision or less, who came within the accepted definition of blindness and who are enrolled in the school for the blind, and who can best be educated by use of large-print books according to the judgment of the superintendents of schools for the blind, from sharing equally with other children enrolled in these schools the Federal funds made available to provide educational materials for all these children.

6. The Federal Security Agency, after due consideration and upon legal advice, ruled that large-print books can be provided under the annual appropriation made for the American Printing House. If the Congress is to make any change of the basic law governing these matters it should be done, I would respectfully submit, only after full and complete hearing of all interested parties upon a measure purely legislative in character.

If the proviso is allowed to stand the schools for the blind will have to purchase the needed large print books for their use with State or local funds and not receive them under the annual appropriation made for the American Printing House.

I trust that the foregoing will provide you the information you desire.

Sincerely,

F. E. DAVIS,
Superintendent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask if it is not a fact that the removal of this restriction will not add to the total expense of the Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It will not add to the total expense of the Government. I reiterate that what the committee had in mind was not to reduce the appropriation at all, but to make sure it was used for the blind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the committee and its chairman for the reversal of their position on this point.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if there is any blame to be borne for this committee amendment, it rests equally on the shoulders of each and every member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and not alone on the shoulders of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. As has been clearly stated, the situation is simply that we now have data, facts, and information, and we now have light which we did not have when the committee amendment was considered by the Committee on Appropriations. We are now able to see the true picture, which we did not see at the time the bill was considered by the committee.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to do what I had intended to do, namely, to pay my tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for the very able, fine, patient, and devoted way in which he conducted the hearings on the bill and in which he guided the bill through the parliamentary procedures, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee. He did an extraordinarily splendid job.

So far as any provision with reference to the blind is concerned, let me say that there is no Member of the Senate in whose hands I would rather leave the fate or the fortune of the blind than in the hands of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. The Senator from New Mexico has a deep sympathy for all his fellow men. There is great compassion in his heart for all who may be unfortunate or disadvantaged. There is in his soul the gospel of humanity and of God Himself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter which I have

received from the Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALABAMA INSTITUTE FOR DEAF AND BLIND,
Talladega, Ala., April 19, 1949.

Senator LISTER HILL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: I was in Washington last week and wanted to see you; but with the press of time and the fact that you were busy on the floor with the TVA steam plant bill, I had to go on to New York. I heard your speech. It was a good one.

Please note the attached in regard to the appropriation for the Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency. I found this when I returned and it may be too late; but hope the *sentence* was deleted in the bill as I understand it was not in the House bill. We are just developing this sight-saving program here at the institute and it amazes me how many children can be helped with the sight-saving classes in our school for blind and it is due in part to making available these large-print textbooks. The enclosed explanation will show the situation at the American Printing House for the Blind in connection with this matter. I believe it is due to lobbying of a specific commercial concern interested in publishing large-print books on a commercial basis only.

You will know what procedure to take in connection with this matter.

I hope you can visit our school sometime and see how this work is progressing. It is certainly a worth-while appropriation.

With highest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. E. BRYAN, *President.*

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if what he has to say is in reference to the amendment?

Mr. MYERS. It is.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I share the views of the Senator from New Mexico that the proviso under discussion should be stricken from the bill. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a telegram from the Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind, a telegram from the Overbrook School for the Blind, a letter from the Royer-Greaves School for the Blind, Paoli, Pa., and a letter from the Overbrook School for the Blind, all asking that the proviso be stricken from the bill.

There being no objections, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *April 18, 1949.*

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge that limiting clause reading as follows. Provided that none of these funds are used for producing large-print books. Be stricken from Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950 which carries appropriation for the American Printing House for the Blind at Louisville, Ky., there is great need for large-type books for use, by partially sighted pupils classified as blind by Federal interpretation. The rider attached to regular appropriation bill for the American Printing House for the Blind if left in will greatly hamper us in our efforts to furnish proper educational opportunity through visual aids to these handicapped pupils. We understand that this bill comes to the Senate floor tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19, so urge your immediate attention.

B. S. JOICE,
Superintendent, Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 18, 1949.*

Senator FRANCIS MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently solicit your aid concerning Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950. Department of Labor which provides funds for the American Printing House for the Blind, Louisville, Ky., which supplies books to all schools for the blind and near-blind due to lobbying of a small concern. The following clause has been inserted in the above bill: 'Provided none of these funds are used for producing large-print books." Many children in schools for the blind are seriously handicapped and cannot use ordinary books but have limited vision and can see the big-print material. Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction sends 22 such children to Overbrook and a number to the Pittsburgh school. Unless this clause is dropped from the bill these children will suffer loss of this Federal-supplied material and tuition costs will then rise. Will appreciate your efforts to eliminate this clause.

JOSEF G. CAUFFMAN,
Overbrook School for the Blind.

OVERBROOK SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 21, 1949.

Hon. FRANCIS MYERS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Re omission of the limiting clause in the Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950. I sent you a day letter relative to the above, and I should like to send additional information in regard to the omission of the limiting clause from the present Senate appropriation bill:

1. It is the purpose of the act of 1879 "To promote the education of the blind" to provide all types of literature and tangible apparatus as are needed in the education of blind students in the public educational institutions for the blind in this country, and which can be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Any limitations of the above would deny the original intent of the act.

2. Materials supplied by the printing house to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal appropriation are designed solely for the use of children who come within the legal definition of blindness. Only these children can be registered to receive benefit from the act, and books can be supplied through the Federal funds for them only, although other children of greater vision may be enrolled in the same educational institutions.

3. The provision of large-type materials is needed for approximately 25 to 30 percent of the blind school population who are legally blind. Most schools have limited or no funds for the purchase of large-type materials for cash. If the printing house cannot supply these materials to them out of the Federal funds, then this group of children will be denied the best materials for their education.

4. The American Printing House for the Blind is a private, nonprofit institution engaged solely in the manufacture of literature and tangible apparatus for the blind and is no way concerned with commercial enterprises. It is not felt that publication of materials for the visually handicapped is feasible commercially, because of high costs of production with relatively small unit distributions of each item. (The present total blind school population is between 5,000 and 6,000 children ranging in age from kindergarten through the high school.)

I shall appreciate very much whatever attention you can give to this important matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEF G. CAUFFMAN,
Principal.

ROYER-GREAVES SCHOOL FOR BLIND,
Paoli, Pa., April 20, 1949.

The Honorable FRANCIS MYERS,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a communication which I have received from the American Printing House for the Blind and which I have marked the important parts.

In this school 15 percent of our pupils are using clear-type books. This is done under the direction of our oculist. As these children are suffering from lack of nerve force, he thinks they should not be under the strain of learning to read with their fingers if their eyes are strengthened by using clear-type books.

If these books cannot be supplied to us by the printing house these blind children will suffer.

We would be glad to have you visit our school.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JESSIE ROYER-GREAVES,
Principal.

ARGUMENT IN BEHALF OF THE OMISSION OF THE LIMITING CLAUSE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1950, PREVENTING THE PROVISION OF LARGE-TYPE BOOKS THROUGH THE ACT—TO PROMOTE THE EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

The primary work of the American Printing House for the Blind is the extension of its services to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal act—"To promote the education of the blind." This act, originally passed in 1879, and now authorizing an appropriation to the printing house up to $125,000 a year, is designed to furnish this institution with the funds to provide the free school texts, tangible apparatus, and other supplementary materials necessary to the education of the pupils under instruction in the public educational institutions for the blind throughout the country. Unfortunately, in many of the States, little or no local funds are available for educational materials for the blind, and the schools for the blind must depend solely on the printing house to obtain them.

In its role as the official schoolbook printery for the blind of the United States and its Territories, the expansion of the services of the printing house has been closely correlated with the historical development of educational methods and curricula in the schools and classes for the blind. In the beginning, books were published in a multiplicity of embossed types, since it was not until 1918 that a single embossed system was adopted in this country. When a more highly contracted system of braille was adopted in 1932, the printing house began printing books in this system. During the 1930's, the talking book—books on phonograph records—was developed, and the printing house established a department for the manufacture of this type of literature. For approximately the past 15 years, there has been a growing sentiment in the schools for the blind that many of the partially blind children under their instruction, whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness, might better be taught by the use of large-print books than braille. For this class of children, totaling between 25 and 30 percent of the blind-school population, the printing

house has therefore recently undertaken the manufacture of school texts in large print, with a view to supplying parallel braille and large-type editions of educational materials, so that both the blind and partially visioned children in our schools for the blind might be taught within the same classroom.

It is the purpose of the printing house to supply large type materials out of the Federal appropriation solely for the benefit of children who come within the legal definition of blindness—and to no one else. When taking the registration of the blind-school population on the first Monday in January of each year, in order to determine the quota allocations of credit for the individual schools on a per capita basis, it is permitted that only those pupils whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness be registered. Further, books and materials in large type are supplied to the schools only in quantities comparable to the registration of their blind pupils. For instance, such materials are not supplied to sight-saving classes whose children are not legally blind and who cannot be registered with the printing house for the Federal appropriation. However, as a private, nonprofit institution for the blind, chartered by the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the printing house may supply any or all of its publications or manufactures for cash to any person or institution, provided the price charged represents only the cost of manufacture plus a reasonable overhead.

The passage of the act of 1879 "To promote the education of the blind" was the result of a memorial to Congress by the schools for the blind. In order to safeguard the expenditure of the Federal funds, the act provided that all superintendents of schools for the blind shall be ex officio trustees of the printing house, and shall exercise complete control, as agents of the Federal Government, in the choice of the materials, and the style and type of their manufacture, which are supplied to their institutions out of the Federal appropriation. The Federal act further stipulated that all materials supplied out of these funds must be "manufactured at" the American Printing House for the Blind. Therefore, if the printing house is not to be permitted to supply large type materials to the schools and classes for the blind out of the Federal appropriation, then the original intent and purpose of the act will be denied, since the schools have definitely indicated a great need and desire for this type of literature to be supplied to them by the printing house.

In summarizing the reasons for omission of the limiting clause from the present Senate appropriation bill the following points should be noted:

1. It is the purpose of the act of 1879 to promote the education of the blind to provide all types of literature and tangible apparatus as are needed in the education of blind students in the public educational institutions for the blind in this country, and which can be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Any limitations of the above would deny the original intent of the act.

2. Materials supplied by the Printing House to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal appropriation are designed solely for the use of children who come within the legal definition of blindness. Only these children can be registered to receive benefit from the act, and books can be supplied through the Federal funds for them only, although other children of greater vision may be enrolled in the same educational institutions.

3. The provision of large type materials is needed for approximately 25 to 30 percent of the blind school population who are legally blind. Most schools have limited or no funds for the purchase of large type materials for cash. If the printing house cannot supply these materials to them out of the Federal funds, then this group of children will be denied the best materials for their education.

4. The American Printing House for the Blind is a private, nonprofit institution engaged solely in the manufacture of literature and tangible apparatus for the blind, and is in no way concerned with commercial enterprises. It is not felt that publication of materials for the visually handicapped is feasible commercially, because of high costs of production with relatively small unit distributions of each item. (The present total blind school population is between 5,000 and 6,000 children ranging in age from kindergarten through the high school.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on the question, I should like to ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the body of the RECORD a telegram from Mr. C. J. Settles, president, Florida School for the Deaf and Blind, together with a letter dated April 18, 1949, from Mr. Settles, in which he substantiates the position which I am sure the Senate will take with reference to the committee amendment.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA., *April 18, 1949.*

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER:

Am advised that Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950, which includes the annual appropriation to the American Printing House for the Blind, Louisville, Ky., for supplying educational materials to schools and classes for the blind, has been reported out of committee to the Senate with following limited clause "*Provided,* None of these funds are used for producing large-print books." If this clause is kept in it will prevent the American Printing House for the Blind printing large-type books for the partially-seeing child. Please see that the limiting clause is dropped from this bill immediately. It was not included in the House bill which has already been passed. The bill referred to is Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950. Will appreciate your immediate attention to this matter.

C. J. SETTLES,
President, Florida School for the Deaf and Blind.

FLORIDA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND,
St. Augustine, Fla., April 18, 1949.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: This letter is in confirmation of a telegram sent you a few minutes ago asking you to see that the limiting clause in the Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950, which includes the annual appropriation to the American Printing House for the Blind at Louisville, Ky., for the purpose of supplying educational materials to the schools and classes for the blind, is dropped from the Senate bill.

If this bill should go through it means that the American Printing House for the Blind, which agency was created by the Federal Government to print books in braille and large or clear type for the partially-seeing child, would have to stop printing clear-type books for the blind. This bill, which has already passed the House, did not include this limiting clause. It is our opinion that it was probably inserted as a result of lobbying by a commercial concern interested in printing large-type books on a commercial basis only.

I am on the board and also a member of the publications committee of the American Printing House for the Blind. Last week I spent two full days in Louisville trying to select books to be put into braille and clear type for the partially seeing child for use in the schools for the blind and classes for the blind in the United States. At that meeting we expressed some concern that some commercial publishing company might try to get this in their hands.

The head of every State school for the blind in the United States is getting in touch with their Senator, so I am sure there will not be any great amount of difficulty in removing this limiting clause.

Thanking you for past favors and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

C. J. SETTLES,
President.

ARGUMENT IN BEHALF OF THE OMISSION OF THE LIMITING CLAUSE IN THE "DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1950" PREVENTING THE PROVISION OF LARGE TYPE BOOKS THROUGH THE ACT "TO PROMOTE THE EDUCATION OF THE BLIND"

The primary work of the American Printing House for the Blind is the extension of its services to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal act to promote the education of the blind. This act, originally passed in 1879, and now authorizing an appropriation to the printing house up to $125,000 a year, is designed to furnish this institution with the funds to provide the free school texts, tangible apparatus, and other supplementary marterials necessary to the education of the pupils under instruction in the public educational institutions for the blind throughout the country. Unfortunately, in many of the States, little or no local funds are available for educational materials for the blind, and the schools for the blind must depend solely on the printing house to obtain them.

In its role as the official schoolbook printery for the blind of the United States and its territories, the expansion of the services of the printing house has been closely correlated with the historical development of educational methods and curricula in the schools and classes for the blind. In the beginning, books were published in a multiplicity of embossed types, since it was not until 1918 that a single embossed system was adopted in this country. When a more highly contracted system of braille was adopted in 1932, the printing house began printing books in this system. During the 1930's, the talking book—books on phonograph records—was developed, and the printing house established a department for the manufacture of this type of literature. For approximately the past 15 years, there has been a growing sentiment in the schools for the blind that many of the partially blind children under their instruction, whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness, might better be taught by the use of large print books than braille. For this class of children, totalling between 25 and 30 percent of the blind school population, the printing house has therefore recently undertaken the manufacture of school texts in large print, with a view to supplying parallel braille and large type editions of educational materials, so that both the blind and partially visioned children in our schools for the blind might be taught within the same classroom.

It is the purpose of the printing house to supply large type materials out of the Federal appropriation solely for the benefit of

children who come within the legal definition of blindness—and to one one else. When taking the registration of the blind school population on the first Monday in January of each year, in order to determine the quota allocations of credit for the individual schools on a per capita basis, it is permitted that only those pupils whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness be registered. Further, books and materials in large type are supplied to the schools only in quantities comparable to the registration of their blind pupils. For instance, such materials are not supplied to sight-saving classes whose children are not legally blind and who cannot be registered with the printing house for the Federal appropriation. However, as a private, nonprofit institution for the blind, chartered by the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the printing house may supply any or all of its publications or manufactures for cash to any person or institution, provided the price charged represents only the cost of manufacture plus a reasonable overhead.

The passage of the act of 1879 "To promote the education of the blind" was the result of a memorial to Congress by the schools for the blind. In order to safeguard the expenditure of the Federal funds, the act provided that all superintendents of schools for the blind shall be ex officio trustees of the printing house, and shall exercise complete control, as agents of the Federal Government, in the choice of the materials, and the style and type of their manufacture, which are supplied to their institutions out of the Federal appropriation. The Federal act further stipulated that all materials supplied out of these funds must be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Therefore, if the printing house is not to be permitted to supply large type materials to the schools and classes for the blind out of the Federal appropriation, then the original intent and purpose of the act will be denied, since the schools have definitely indicated a great need and desire for this type of literature to be supplied to them by the printing house.

In summarizing the reasons for omission of the limiting clause from the present Senate appropriation bill, the following points should be noted:

1. It is the purpose of the act of 1879 "to promote the education of the blind" to provide all types of literature and tangible apparatus as are needed in the education of blind students in the public educational institutions for the blind in this country, and which can be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Any limitations of the above would deny the original intent of the act.

2. Materials supplied by the printing house to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal appropriation are designed solely for the use of children who come within the legal definition of blindness. Only these children can be registered to receive benefit from the act, and books can be supplied through the Federal funds for them only, although other children of greater vision may be enrolled in the same educational institutions.

3. The provision of large-type materials is needed for approximately 25 to 30 percent of the blind school population who are legally blind. Most schools have limited or no funds for the purchase of large-type materials for cash. If the printing house cannot supply these materials to them out of the Federal funds, then this group of children will be denied the best materials for their education.

4. The American Printing House for the Blind is a private, nonprofit institution engaged solely in the manufacture of literature and tangible apparatus for the blind, and is no way concerned with commercial enterprises. It is not felt that publication of materials for the visually handicapped is feasible commercially, because of high costs of production with relatively small unit distributions of each item. (The present total blind school population is between 5,000 and 6,000 children ranging in age from kindergarten through the high school.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 6, lines 12 and 13.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Employees' Compensation," on page 6, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$41,000" and insert "$46,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Food and Drug Administration," on page 9, line 15, after "District of Columbia", to insert "and elsewhere."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 12, line 14, after "(20 U. S. C. 15h)", to strike out "$19,842,760" and insert "$29,-301,740"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That the apportionment to the States shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed $19,842,760 for the current fiscal year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 19, after the word "same", to strike out "$1,860,000" and insert "$2,009,800"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "of which not less than $522,300 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to send to the desk an amendment to the section pertaining to vocational rehabilitation. I think we are coming to page 14 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 17, line 22, after the word "only", to strike out "$13,600,000" and insert "$16,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 6, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$7,350,000" and insert "$7,450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 20, after the word "only", to strike out "$1,000,000' and insert "$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 12, after the word "activities", to strike out "$11,387,000" and insert "$11,-612,000"; and in line 13, after the word "which", to strike out "$2,663,000" and insert "$2,888,000."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I believe that amendment deals with mental health. Would the Senator from New Mexico be kind enough to carry that over and take it up at the same time we consider the heart and cancer section?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PEPPER. I am prepared to offer an amendment now, or deal with the three together.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would prefer that the three be considered together.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that it go over and be taken up after the other committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will go over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 17, after "(5 U. S. C. 150)", to strike out "$167,000" and insert "$267,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 11, after the word "animals", to strike out "$11,800,000" and insert "$12,075,000."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to query the chairman of the subcommittee on the item on page 22, line 11.

I am sure the Senator will recall the conversation in the committee about the necessity for adding $50,000 for research in the field of gastroenterology. I admit I am not very familiar with these medical terms. The committee agreed to the increase of the $50,000, and the report definitely shows that the $200,000 now in the bill will be available for research in the whole field of stomach ailments. That is putting it in layman's language.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the report so indicates on page 6.

Mr. GURNEY. If I may say so to the Senator, the report is in a way turned around.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The committee understands that $150,000 was included in the amount allowed by the House for this purpose, and a $50,000 increase recommended will provide a total amount of $200,000 for investigation of peptic ulcers.

Mr. GURNEY. At the time the committee approved the bill, the instruction was the last three words should be stricken, and that the amount would be made $200,000 for the whole field of research in stomach trouble. It should read "for gastroenterology." There is no argument at all with the House action providing $150,000 for research having to do with peptic ulcers. I therefore give notice that the report is written incorrectly on page 6, and I hope the Senator will instruct the conferees to make it clear what the $50,000 raise was to include.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The chairman of the subcommittee will give attention to that.

Mr. GURNEY. Certainly there was no justification for raising this amount unless the research could be all-inclusive in the whole field of gastroenterology.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 22, line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 3, after the word "act," to strike out "$16,400,000" and insert "$17,027,000."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 21, after the word "only," to strike out "$7,725,000" and insert "$8,725,000."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment go over, and the item on page 24, line 2, dealing with the National Heart Institute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the items will be passed over.

The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 13, to insert:

Research facilities, National Institute of Dental Research: For the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research, as authorized by section 5 of the National Dental Research Act, approved June 24, 1948 (Public Law 755, 80th Cong.), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, which amount, except such part as may be necessary for incidental expenses for the Public Health Service, shall be transferred to the Federal Works Agency for the performance of the work for which the appropriation is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 3, to insert:

Special vital-statistics projects: For expenses necessary for vital-statistics projects directly related to the seventeenth decennial census, $295,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 18, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital," on page 28, line 3, after the word "illness", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$1,820,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 30, line 20, after the words "excess of", to strike out "$157,500,000" and insert "$160,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 1, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$4,450,000" and insert "$4,900,000"; and in the same line, after the words "of which", to strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator," on page 37, line 1, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$2,292,000" and insert "$2,418,000"; and in line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$335,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 8, after the word "Operations", to strike out "$944,800" and insert "$1,043,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions," on page 39, after line 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 207. The Federal Security Administrator, if he finds it necessary for the more practical and efficient operation of the Agency, shall have the authority to transfer with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to the foregoing appropriations under this title from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency such sums as represent a consolidation in the Office of the Administrator of any of the administrative functions of said constituent units: *Provided*, That no such transfer of funds shall be made unless the consolidation of administrative functions will result in a reduction of administrative salary and other expenses and such reduction is accompanied by savings in funds appropriated to the Federal Security Agency which savings shall not be expended for any other purposes but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 20, to change the section number from "207" to "208."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 8, to change the section number from "208" to "209."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—Railroad Retirement Board," on page 42, line 10, after the word "act," to strike out "$715,889,000" and insert "$882,741,000."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which is in the hands of the clerk, and ask to have it read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 42, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$882,741,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$757,602,000"; and

On page 42, line 17, to strike out "$882,741,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$757,602,000."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], in charge of the bill, a question without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether I correctly understand that the amendment is in the substance agreeable to him. If it is not, I should like to argue it. If it is, then I shall not argue it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Several Senators are interested in the provision which is now being discussed, including the amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, and it seems that possibly there are other Senators who would like to have the matter go over until tomorrow. That was my understanding this afternoon. Therefore, without committing myself to the Senator from Massachusetts on his amendment. I should prefer that we let the matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is perfectly agreeable to me. As I understand, the amendment is offered and is a part of the RECORD, so that it will come up for discussion at the proper time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. If the Senate should adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator, in order to make the bill read properly, should not the language begining with the word "of" on line 11 down to and including the word "that" on line 17, and the amount, "$882,741,000", be stricken out?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand the parliamentary situation, if my amendment shall be agreed to, the proviso which is printed in italic to which the Senator from Michigan refers, running from line 11 through line 17, would be opposed and rejected when it came up. If my amendment shall not be agreed to, then of course the committee amendment will prevail. But if, as I have said, my amendment shall be agreed to, automatically the Senate should strike out the committee amendment on the lines indicated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could not the Senator's amendment embrace the entire committee amendment, so that, if agreed to, it would delete that language, but if it were not agreed to, the language would stay in the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I propound a parliamentary inquiry. I inquire whether it is possible for me to include the committee amendment in my amendment? If so, I shall modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment so as to strike out the language inserted by the committee, all as a part of one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to submit an inquiry to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. Would the Senator make a similar reply respecting any amendments which other Senators might desire to have considered?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator mean that they would go over until tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are through with the bill except for the amendments relating to cancer, heart, mental health, and the railroad-retirement proposal.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the distinguished Senator if his agreement as to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts applies to the other amendments?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. So all the Senate can do this afternoon is to continue to debate committee amendments and vote on them tomorrow?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. No further committee amendments can be acted upon tonight. And no other action can be taken tonight unless further amendments are offered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few moments ago I mentioned that I should like to submit an amendment pertaining to the portion of the appropriations bill entitled "Office of Vocational Rehabilitation." I send to the desk the amendment, which I ask to have printed and to lie on the table, and be considered in due time by the Senate, when it discusses the particular portion of the bill to which the amendment applies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS—LETTER FROM O. K. LAROQUE

Mr. MYERS obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact that revisions of some regulations and rules have been proposed by the Home Loan Bank Board in connection with various banks, and in view of the fact that there have been some protests by the Federal Reserve Board and some protests by various banking institutions throughout the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following my short statement, a lengthy letter of explanation written to me by Mr. O. K. LaRoque, member of the board of the Home Loan Bank Board.

I may add that while these regulations were to have been put into effect within 30 days, the Home Loan Bank Board has held up putting these rules and regulations into effect with the thought that they could probably reach an agreement with the Federal Reserve Board and the various independent and Government banking institutions of the country. My purpose in placing the letter in the body of the RECORD is so that those who have written many letters requesting information can obtain the information by reading Mr. LaRoque's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY
HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1949.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: In response to telephone inquiry from Mr. Thomas H. Daniel, of your office, we are pleased to advise in connection with proposed revisions of rules and regulations relating to the organization and operation of Federal savings and loan associations.

In order to meet changing economic conditions, especially in the thrift and home-financing field, it has been deemed necessary and desirable from time to time to approve amendments to outstanding charters issued to these thrift institutions and amend operating regulations to provide reasonable flexibility in operations while, at the same time, affording ample protection to the public in the investments in these institutions without unreasonable restrictions which might tend to centralize management above the local level.

As a result, an accumulation of amendments to charters, as well as amendments to regulations, has brought about confusion and lack of understanding.

About a year ago, a staff committee acting under the chairmanship of the writer was appointed with instructions to prepare and submit to the Board proposals for a complete revision of charter and regulations not inconsistent with legislative enactments authorizing the creation and operation of these institutions, and in accord with the best practices of local mutual thrift and home-financing institutions. This committee gave careful and diligent consideration to all phases of the field of activity in which these mutual thrift institutions operate, and consulted with the managers throughout the country who have for years operated sound and well-managed thrift institutions.

As a result of these efforts, the committee submitted to the Board a report recommending the adoption of what we believe to be reasonable regulations safeguarding the investments of funds on the part of the public, and providing means for home ownership through sound investment of the savings in these mutual institutions of approximately $11,000,000,000 at this time. After study and consideration by the Board, the proposal to amend and revise the existing regulations was published in the Federal Register on March 11, 1949. Since the date of the publication we have received numerous suggestions for clarification and changes, all of which are being given earnest and sincere consideration by the Board.

Generally speaking, the suggestions received have been of a constructive nature. On the part of those who are familiar with the organization and operation of these institutions, it is an accepted fact that the amendments proposed are nothing more nor less than a mere strengthening, streamlining and bringing up to date existing regulations, and is in no sense intended to change either the type or method of operation, or provide in any manner any conflict with the provisions of statute under which they have been organized.

Under the proposed regulations and charter provisions, no change whatever is made in the legal status of these institutions from the type of mutual thrift associations authorized in section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended.

It is significant, however, that the Washington office of a trade organization which purports to represent the views of the commercial banking interests filed with us a brief on March 30 assuming to interpret the proposed rules and regulations and insisting that same should not be permitted to be effective and should be withdrawn by the Home Loan Bank Board. This document was filed without inquiry or conference with any member of this board, and numerous allegations are made which indicate a lack of understanding or an intentional distortion of the facts, all of which could have been easily explained had there been evidence of desire for information.

Exception is taken to the use of the term "savings account." Their interpretation of this term indicates their understanding that it establishes a debtor-creditor relationship similar to depositors in commercial banks. A careful reading of the proposed amendment contradicts this interpretation. The proposed regulation merely refers to one type of savings account as a share interest accumulation rather than the three or four types of share accounts heretofore used in these associations, and is intended only to simplify and make more understandable the character of these investments which accumulate as a share interest in the associations. The proposed regulations definitely define the term "savings account" as meaning "the monetary interest of the holder thereof in the capital of a Federal savings and loan association."

The proposed charter refers to the fact that the association may "raise its capital * * * by accepting payments on savings accounts representing share interests in the associations."

There is nothing new in this terminology. In the statute creating the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the term "accounts" is used as descriptive of insurance liability and is defined as "means a share, certificate, or deposit account of a type approved by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation which is held by an insured member in an insured institution and which is insured under the provisions of this title."

Another allegation states that the regulations represent an attempt to change the name of Federal savings and loan associations in violation of the statute creating these institutions. The term, or title, "Federal savings association" is clearly defined in the regulations to mean "a Federal savings and loan association chartered by the Board as provided in section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended." The use of this term is descriptive only, just as the term "Board" is used throughout the regulations as referring to the Home Loan Bank Board. Other descriptive terms are used and defined for the purpose of convenience and brevity. The use of this term "Federal savings association" does not in any manner change the corporate title of the institution, and the proposed charter under section 1 states "the full corporate title of the Federal savings association hereby chartered is ------ Federal Savings and Loan Association ------." We have used the term "Federal savings association" merely for the purpose of reference, in a manner somewhat similar to a descriptive term relating to national banks. You, of course, recognize the fact that the national banks call themselves "------ National Bank ------," when, as a matter of fact, throughout the National Bank Act these fine institutions are referred to and authorized to operate as "National Banking Associations." The terms "savings associations" and "savings accounts" are not unusual in similar thrift institutions operating under State charters. In some States this same type of thrift institution is chartered under the corporate title "Cooperative Bank."

Another item which appears to cause some concern in the brief submitted relates to the matter of establishment of branches. Since 1934 the regulations have made provision for the establishment of branch offices under certain conditions. The only change made in this regulation is a strengthening of standards under which such branches may be established. Notwithstanding the fact that provision for branches has been in the regulations for more than 14 years, only a very small number have been authorized. It is a fact that when an application for a branch is filed with this office, we apply the same standards that would apply in the consideration of an application for the organization of a new Federal association, with special reference to the needs of the community and whether or not the establishment of such branch would be injurious to existing thrift institutions. No branch is authorized until after a full and complete notice has been given to the public and to all interested parties and a public hearing held with opportunity for any opposition that may be presented.

The brief refers to a provision in the regulations, which permits certain types of unsecured loans. References to this subject indicate a lack of knowledge or understanding of the regulation, type of institution, and provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This Servicemens' Readjustment Act makes specific provision for certain types of loans that may be made by Federal savings associations and our regulations are intended

to conform to the provisions of this act and for no other purpose.

Numerous other allegations and expressions of opinion are noted. These allegations and expressions of opinion are of such nature that they are not provocative of serious thought and fail to merit the dignity of denial.

Unfortunately, the good citizens and sound businessmen from whom complaints have been received appear to have based their objections and complaints on the information gathered from this brief, which appears to have been widely publicized through the press and other media. Their expressions are no doubt based on this misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the proposed regulations.

It is our firm opinion that should these good people avail themselves of an opportunity to read and analyze the proposed regulations which were published in the Federal Register on March 11, they will more readily understand the misinterpretation and distortion which has been placed upon the proposals through information which has been disseminated from the office of a trade association which assumes to be a competitor of these mutual thrift institutions. We want you and your associates to know of the sincere desire of every member of this Board to fully comply with the spirit and letter of the statutes under which we operate, and that we are conscious of our responsibility to the public interest in the sound development of thrift throughout the Nation.

With assurances of high esteem, I am,

Yours very truly,

O. K. LAROQUE,
Board Member.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 27, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Hon. Robert M. Gibson, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Donald C. Means, rector, St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Altoona, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we, Thy needy creatures, render Thee our humble praises for Thy preservation of us from the beginning of our lives to this day. We prayerfully beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for the President of our Nation and this House of Representatives assembled, that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the good of Thy church, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people, that all things may be so settled and ordered by their endeavors upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations. And Thou who hast given us this good land for our heritage, grant that we may always be a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name the authority of government is entrusted, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth.

In times of peace and prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of adversity suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; for the sake of Him who died and rose again, came among us as One that serveth, and ever liveth to make intercession for us, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 900. An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1169) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 49–10.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1271) entitled "An act for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TERMINATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF 65,000-TON SUPERCARRIER

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, made a courageous and a momentous decision. He ordered the termination of the construction of the 65,000-ton so-called supercarrier.

In years past I helped build a two-ocean Navy. I am proud to think that was correct, for we need a two-ocean Navy to fight any war that comes.

Now we know that if war should ever come again it will be a struggle with a land power.

It is simply a matter of the proper allocation of war missions between the Navy and Air Force.

It is the business of the Air Force to use long-range bombers in time of war. And yet, this carrier was to accommodate such long-range bombers.

We cannot afford the luxury of two strategic air forces. We cannot afford an experimental vessel that, even without its aircraft, costs as much as 60 B–36 long-range bombers.

We should reserve strategic air warfare to the Air Force.

And we should reserve to the Navy its historic role of controlling the seas. I do not now—and I never will—advocate depreciation of our Navy.

Secretary Johnson is to be commended both for the nature of his decision and for moving promptly to resolve this important matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on November 15, 1946, the United States Employment Service, under the Secretary of Labor, was transferred to the State agency in each State designated under section IV of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended, as the agency to administer the State-wide system of public employment offices in cooperation with the United States Employment Service.

This bill brings this service back to the Federal Government and places it in the United States Department of Labor, where it was during the war. It was found necessary during the war to have a coordination of our employment service. The United States Employment Service made an enviable record in furnishing manpower during the war. It rendered a service that has not been equaled since its return to the various States and cannot be equaled by the employment services of the various States. There is as great a demand for coordination and for a unified employment system today as there ever was. The same high degree of efficiency is as desirable now as it was during the war. This service simply cannot be operated efficiently when it is necessary to operate as 48 separate agencies; when its employees are in many States under the spoils system. This bill would return these employees to the civil service of the United States Government and to the benefits of such civil service which many of them enjoyed in years previous.

The funds for this service are paid in their entirety by the Federal Government.

Experience has shown us that in industrial and farm labor problems State lines are not respected. Many of our labor problems and labor markets straddle State lines and it is illogical to have a division of authority in the handling of these labor problems.

Farm labor is by its very nature interstate in character.

A careful study and analysis of this problem leads me to the conclusion that the only sensible, satisfactory solution to these employment problems, lies in the return of the employment service from the 48 States to the United States Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "No Depression Yet" by George Soule.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the Honorable Robert Jerome Dunne, judge of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Ill.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD relating to a bill he introduced yesterday.

Mr. BURKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Saturday Evening Post; also a letter from the mayor of the village of Rossford, Ohio, on the subject of pollution.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a comparison in short form between his bill, H. R. 4272, and the Lesinski bill, H. R. 3190.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. WAGNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star entitled "Out of Tune."

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in six separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from yesterday's Evening Star.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Coatesville (Pa.) Record.

EXTRAVAGANT SPENDING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, today the fliers who have been in the air for 6 weeks, or 1,008 hours, will land at Fullerton, Calif. That is a wonderful feat.

How grand it would be if this present administration, the President, and Congress would soon come to earth; stop spending us into bankruptcy. For 18 years it has been the most extravagant, incompetent, reckless administration in the history of our country or the world. If anyone ever was in the air, it has been this administration. This year they are spending at the rate of over $40,000,000,000. In the 456 years since Columbus' discovery of America the value of all the gold mined in the world has been about $40,000,000,000.

Do you not think it is time to stop? Land, get your feet on solid ground. With Secretary Brannan's ridiculous agriculture program which will cost additional billions, and the President's national health program brought here yesterday adding six or seven billion more, and all the other things this administration has proposed recently costing many more billions of dollars, do you not think it is time for us to get down to earth? Congressmen, we need more business in Government, and less Government in business. Come down to earth, get your feet on solid ground, in the name of all that is sacred. For the continuation of this Government of ours, come to earth. Get out of the clouds of radical spending, come down to earth, land on a solid foundation of honesty, integrity, and good, sound judgment for less government in Washington and more government in the States and the local communities where the people know our people and what is best for them and our country. God save America before it is too late.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier of Tuesday, April 19, 1949, entitled "Taxes Versus Plums."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two resolutions.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Iowa Development Commission.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Mothers' Group of the Torrington Council of Catholic Women.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two short speeches.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the Oregon Legislature.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include two editorials.

COMMUNISTIC ACTIVITIES IN CHINA

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, this morning's papers carry the story of Communist soldiers entering our embassy in China and placing our ambassador un-

der what amounts to house arrest. There is a hint that the embassy property will be redistributed to the people. All this, I presume, will be justified in the State Department as an aspect of agrarian reform.

I wonder if our State Department is really enjoying the consequences of this policy of waiting for the dust to settle in China? When it has settled it may be found to have settled on the ruins of millions of dollars of American property and on the corpses of many American citizens whose only offense was to love their homes and work in China. They will lie in the good earth of China along with those American soldiers who fell in the faith, now betrayed, that an independent China mattered to us. The missionaries may legitimately expect the treatment accorded Cardinal Mindszenty.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast by Mr. Henry J. Taylor.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Cincinnati Inquirer.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include certain newspaper material and also a radio address by Mr. George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. DONOHUE and Mr. HORAN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two leaflets by Mr. Nicholson, Washington attorney, and another pamphlet covering the principles of American Government.

COST OF VETERANS' PENSION BILL A TIP TO THE WAITER COMPARED WITH THE TRILLION TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY BILLION FOR SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago we had the soldiers' pension bill before the House. We heard members scream about the billions it would cost.

I wish you could see the information we have on what this proposed social-security program sponsored by the enemies of the veterans' pension bill will cost. By the year 2000 this over-all social-security program that is now being proposed will cost $1,250,000,000,000. The World War I veterans will not be taken care of under it. They will be turned out to gnaw the corncob in their old days, especially the ones on the farm.

Then we find that by the year 1990, so the Social Security Board tells us, the cost of that social-security program will be between $15,000,000,000 and $18,000,000,000 a year. That means a cost of the value of 100,000,000 bales of cotton a year, or as much cotton approximately as is produced in 10 years.

My God, where is this country headed?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 78]

Allen, La.	Goodwin	Noland
Andrews	Gregory	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Hall,	Plumley
Bennett, Mich.	Edwin Arthur	Powell
Bolton, Ohio	Hart	Reed, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Hays, Ark.	Regan
Carroll	Hedrick	Richards
Celler	Heller	Sabath
Clevenger	Hill	Simpson, Pa.
Cox	Hobbs	Smathers
Cunningham	Hoeven	Smith, Ohio
Curtis	Jenison	Taylor
Davies, N. Y.	Jennings	Thomas, N. J.
Davis, Tenn.	Judd	Thompson
deGraffenried	Kearney	Vursell
Doughton	Kunkel	Walsh
Engel, Mich.	LeCompte	Whitaker
Fugate	McCulloch	White, Idaho
Gamble	Marcantonio	Wickersham
Garmatz	Multer	
Gilmer	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 191 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 13 minutes. I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is about to consider a bill, H. R. 2032, which involves the most important legislation that will be presented to Congress during the eighty-first session.

H. R. 2032 endeavors to undo our greatest legislative mistake since the days of the Volstead Prohibition Act. H. R. 2032 not only calls for the repeal of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, but provides for constructive changes in the Wagner National Labor Relations Act of 1935, which it reenacts. These changes in the original Wagner Act curtail and prohibit jurisdictional disputes and secondary boycotts. It also would set up machinery which encourages collective bargaining and arbitration of disputes arising out of the interpretation of contracts between labor and management. H. R. 2032 improves the Wagner Act by providing for legislation concerning strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest. Under this provision, it does not jeopardize or endanger the basic rights of labor unions or our democratic freedoms as does the Taft-Hartley Act on the same provision. The underlying principle involved in this new labor legislation is the promotion of free collective bargaining between employer and employee.

HARTLEY COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Rules Committee held extended sessions on four different days, hearing testimony from members of the House Labor and Education Committee regarding this bill. I have read the minority report submitted and signed by the Republican members of the Committee on Education and Labor. The first five pages of this report are taken up criticizing the chairman of the Labor Committee and complaining that they received unjust treatment during the hearing. This will be part of the Republican strategy during this debate to take our minds off the real issue. Since the Republican committee members are relying on the smoke screen of committee procedure to muddy the thinking on the labor restrictions in the Taft-Hartley law, I think the new Members of the Eighty-first Congress should know what happened in the Hartley Labor and Education Committee 2 years ago.

At that time this Congress was made the victim of the best organized and most highly financed legislative lobby in the history of Washington. I was a member of the House Education and Labor Committee 2 years ago and personally attended 5 weeks of public hearings. Most of these hearings I believe were conducted primarily to send out antiunion propaganda and soften the minds of the American public for the approach of the

Taft-Hartley law. Whenever a celebrated-name witness appeared to present antilabor testimony the caucus room in the old House Office Building was literally cluttered with klieg lights, television apparatus, radio broadcasting machinery, recording equipment, and special installation of tables to accommodate reporters and radio commentators. Very few of us realized 2 years ago that the transforming of the Labor Committee hearing in the House Caucus room into a Hollywood movie lot was just part of the well-organized propaganda of the National Association of Manufacturers and their subsidiaries to undermine public opinion against organized labor in America.

The arbitrary tactics which existed during the hearings continued after the 5 weeks of open hearings were closed. Then the majority members went into secret session and drew the iron curtain against most of the minority members of the Education and Labor Committee. For almost 2 weeks, Chairman Hartley and most of the Republicans members were closeted with Theodore Eiserman, attorney for Chrysler Corporation, Attorney Jerry Morgan, and others, in the drawing up of the most complicated, deceptive, and highly involved piece of legislation that has passed the House in congressional history. Finally, after almost 2 weeks of secret meetings, Chairman Hartley officially called a meeting of all the members of the House Education and Labor Committee and immediately asked that this 76-page typewritten legal document be passed by the committee at that meeting. By reason of strenuous protest on the part of myself and other members who were not asked to sit in with the legal experts, Chairman Hartley postponed the vote on passage until the following day. The following day this complex document was railroaded through the committee section by section without any opportunity of study for possible amendments by a considerable number of the committee members.

Never in my observation of committee procedure was a piece of legislation ever born under such kangaroo-committee tactics as launched the origin of the Taft-Hartley Act on the floor of this House.

PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

Anyhow, the unfortunate procedure inaugurated by Chairman Hartley 2 years ago, in conducting the hearings and deliberations of the Labor Committee paralleled the type of legislation which finally resulted from such an ignoble beginning. Two years ago, during debate on this floor members of the House Labor Committee, including myself, protested against the procedure of the committee. The only defense of the actions of Chairman Hartley's committee was brought forth by Congressman CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio. On page 3443 of the 1947 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Congressman BROWN'S remarks contain the following quote:

> The Republican Party now has the responsibility for preparing and bringing legislation to this floor for action. That is exactly what this committee has done, as I understand it.

I have a great respect for Congressman BROWN'S opinion, but evidently from his remarks, he was interpreting that the November election of 1946 had given the Republican Party a mandate for the Taft-Hartley law. If Congressman BROWN was correct 2 years ago, certainly the Democratic members of the Labor Committee and the Eighty-first Congress, after the verdict of November 1948, have the responsibility for preparing and bringing legislation to this floor for action that will repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

The Members who were on the floor before the adjournment of the regular session last summer, remember my good friend and Hoosier colleague Congressman HALLECK, then the majority leader, challenging and daring President Truman and the Democratic platform to make the Taft-Hartley Act an issue before the American people. That and similar challenges by Republican statesmen were accepted by the President and the Democratic Party. The people spoke emphatically last November.

WAGNER ACT NEVER GIVEN FAIR TEST

I think it is well to very briefly review labor legislation since World War I.

Every Member recollects the industrial disputes after World War I and during the 1920's. That period was shadowed with strikes involving bloodshed and loss of life and property. During this period, union labor and the wage earners were unsuccessful in making any progress. Low wages, poor working conditions, chaos, and bitterness hampered production and was one of the reasons for the deplorable depression of 1929 to 1933.

The Wagner Act was passed in 1935. Prominent lawyers told their clients that the act was unconstitutional. Employers acted accordingly. In 1937 the Supreme Court finally decided that it was constitutional. Until then the Wagner Act could not be enforced. During the next 2 years, the same lawyers advised their employer-clients as to the ways and means of evading, obstructing, and violating the Wagner Act.

Then came the war period. With the end of the war, as after every war or serious dislocation, we had a period of readjustment. In changing from a war economy to a peacetime economy, we naturally had labor management difficulties and disputes. During the Eightieth Congress, propagandists cleverly and adroitly dramatized this situation, as I have already outlined, and passed the Taft-Hartley law.

The history of the Wagner Act reveals that at no time has it been given a just and honest test over a period of time.

TAFT-HARTLEY ANTILABOR

Many statements of generality have been made pro and con regarding the Taft-Hartley law. It is my earnest wish that every Member of Congress, before he votes on this legislation, read, line by line, paragraph by paragraph, the complex and involved provisions set out in the Taft-Hartley law.

A short time ago, Business Week magazine, which is recognized as the voice of big business in this country, in an article on the labor legislation, stated in its column:

The Taft-Hartley law has failed—it went too far. It crossed the narrow line separating a law which aims only to regulate, from one which could destroy.

A Member of Congress, in voting on this legislation, should not take the word of any commentator or propagandist, but a close study of this law will reveal that Chairman Hartley was correct 2 years ago during the closing hours of debate when he admitted on the floor of this House that "everything that this bill (Taft-Hartley law) contains does not meet the eye."

A close examination of the Taft-Hartley law will present its one-sided restrictions on labor, as set out in its various provisions dealing with: First, injunctions; second, union employer responsibility; third, boycotts; fourth, jurisdictional disputes; fifth, penalties against striking employees; sixth, damage suits; seventh, arbitration of disputes over interpretation of existing contracts; eighth, union security; ninth, general counsel for board procedure; tenth, check-off; eleventh, health and welfare funds; twelfth, free-speech provisions; thirteenth, restrictions on particular groups of employees; fourteenth, complex system of elections; fifteenth, political expenditures; and sixteenth, outlawing closed shops. A study of these items will reveal that the Taft-Hartley law is a union-busting device.

WOOD BILL

Not in my memory has legislation been filed with such mysterious origin as the Wood bill. Two so-called Wood bills have been presented. The first was H. R. 3228 and the second is H. R. 4290.

Congressman WOOD appeared before the Rules Committee in behalf of the first. His knowledge of its content was very limited, according to his own testimony. Laudatory statements were made in the Rules Committee for Congressman Cox and others regarding the first Wood bill. He said that it contained the recommendations of the so-called watch dog committee.

When I was home during the Easter recess, I read in a magazine that the first Wood bill, H. R. 3228, was withdrawn and a second Wood bill, H. R. 4290, was substituted. The article further said that the first Wood bill was more antilabor than the Taft-Hartley law, but that some Republican Congressmen revolted and the gentlemen from Georgia, Congressmen Cox and WOOD, consented to file another Wood bill and make it more palatable to some of the Republican rebels.

Why is the Republican leadership insisting that the good old Republican names like Taft and Hartley be erased from the National Labor Relations Act of 1947?

I ask why some of the Republican members of the Labor Committee have not the courage to lend their name to the so-called Wood bill? Is it because the Grand Old Party suffered such a defeat last November with two grand old Republican names from Ohio and New

Jersey labeling antilabor legislation? I ask why the Republicans are now disclaiming any authorship of this 1949 Taft-Hartley Act known as the Wood bill? Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and most northern Republicans now want to sever all connections with Taft-Hartley and send it as far down south of Mason and Dixon's line as possible. Why pick on the State of Georgia? Has not Georgia suffered enough back through the years? It went through the reconstruction period, the Ku Klux Klan, two governors at the same time, and now the Republican leaders are trying to dump the Taft-Hartley law—lock, stock, and barrel—onto its already overburdened shoulders.

No; you cannot change the Taft-Hartley law by merely changing its name to the Wood bill. You cannot wrap limburger cheese in a beautiful pink, green, and black paper and conceal the odor.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

Most Members remember reading in the newspapers in the fall of 1947 when Earl Bunting, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, admonished the NAM members not to be too hasty in taking advantage of the powers given them under the Taft-Hartley law. Evidently Mr. Bunting did not want the sixty-odd million wage earners in America and the 15,000,000 union members in America to realize its restrictive provisions until after the election in November 1948. I do not know whether Mr. Bunting has issued any orders to his members since November 2, 1948, but the American people on that day issued an order to the Congress of the United States. One hundred and three Members who voted for the Taft-Hartley law in the Eightieth Congress are not present today. In my own State of Indiana, 9 of our 11 Members in the Eightieth Congress voted for the Taft-Hartley law—6 of them are not in the Eighty-first Congress.

The Taft-Hartley law, as it is now written, must be repealed in this session of the Eighty-first Congress. The issues were drawn last November and the people spoke at the polls—let the Congress carry out the mandate.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule which is presently under discussion is an open rule. It will make in order a consideration of the Lesinski bill but will permit every Member of the House to present germane amendments which can then be acted upon by the House as a whole.

I do not believe that any bill on which a rule has been asked in recent years has been as fully discussed as was this bill. The Rules Committee devoted the better part of 5 days to its consideration. The Rules Committee did this because the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, in his opening remarks, requested a closed rule. It was soon apparent from the testimony given that this request for a closed rule, which would have allowed no Member to offer an amendment on the floor of the House, followed quite logically the procedure which had been pursued within the committee itself.

The Lesinski bill, while bearing the name of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, was drafted in the Government departments. Hearings on it were held by a subcommittee, but never by the full committee. The subcommittee voted out the bill exactly as it was originally drafted. The full committee then accepted the recommendations of the subcommittee without even reading the bill section by section so as to allow different members of the committee to speak for it or even to offer amendments. In other words, the gag rule was applied in committee. Before debate on this matter has been concluded, you will undoubtedly hear a great deal more with respect to the proceedings within the committee itself.

I am glad that the rule now under consideration is an open rule. If adopted, it will allow the House of Representatives to work its will in a democratic way. It will allow of sufficiently long debate so that every Member should have a much better appreciation of the great issues that are involved in trying to write any labor-management legislation.

When general debate begins on the Lesinski bill, members of the committee will tell you in detail just what the Lesinski bill would do. I shall content myself with but one brief statement in regard to the Lesinski bill. It repeals every part and every provision of the Taft-Hartley law and reenacts the Wagner law with some amendments, none of which were found in the Taft-Hartley law. In other words, it states legislatively that there was not a single provision of the Taft-Hartley law which was worth retaining—a statement insulting to the many Members of this House who, in good faith, voted for that law. No one has ever claimed that a perfect labor-management relations bill could be written or that any bill could not be perfected by amendment. But an assertion that a law which has been on the statute books for nearly 2 years and which has, in most respects, operated extremely fairly to both labor and management must be destroyed in toto is clearly the product of heavily prejudiced minds.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it might be worthy of note that on the final passage of the measure 106 Democrats voted for it and 71 against it; that the final vote was 331 for the bill, 83 against. A majority of the present Members of the House voted for the bill.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

From the evidence presented before the Rules Committee, it was obvious that many members of the Committee on Education and Labor were anxious to benefit by the hearings that had been held in subcommittee and by the public testimony which has been given over the last 18 months by representatives of labor, management, and the public with respect to the Taft-Hartley law. They were apparently convinced that there were a number of changes which should be made in the existing law. This conviction was derived mostly from the testimony of leaders of organized labor. As these members were precluded from offering amendments to the Lesinski bill, they drafted a separate piece of legislation which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. WOOD, a member of the Committee, as a substitute for the Lesinski bill.

In the event that such a motion is made, then the procedure before this House would be as follows: The substitute bill would be in the nature of an amendment to the Lesinski bill. Perfecting amendments to any part of that amendment could be offered, thus making the word substitute an effective vehicle on which the House could work its will. After every perfecting amendment which was offered had been disposed of, then a single vote would come on accepting the main amendment. If accepted in committee, the Committee would then rise and the amendment could be roll called, but none of the perfecting amendments could be voted upon separately.

In the event that the amendment should fail of adoption in the Committee of the Whole, the Lesinski bill itself would then be read section by section for amendment. Anyone who is familiar with the Lesinski bill must know that it is so drafted as to make any substantive amendment virtually impossible. To insert even the least controversial features of the Taft-Hartley law would require at least 60 printed pages of amendments.

I have examined with great care the substitute bill to which I referred, and which I hope will be offered. It is a good bill. While it repeals the Taft-Hartley law, it nevertheless reenacts many of its principal provisions and incorporates a number of amendments. Each one of these amendments is intended to meet a specific objection of labor leaders which, in the opinion of members of the Committee on Education and Labor, were valid objections. It could be termed neither a promanagement nor a prolabor bill. It is a sincere effort to legislate in a spirit of fair play to both sides while, at the same time, keeping the public interest constantly in mind.

Let me examine briefly the principal changes which it makes in the existing law and the objections posed by labor leaders which these changes are intended to correct.

First, leaders of organized labor have severely criticized, as being too cumbersome and seeking to undermine their representatives, the provisions of existing law which prohibit unions from negotiating for a union shop contract without being first authorized to do so through an election among the employees involved. These leaders were also extremely critical of the provisions that required approval by a majority of the employees eligible to vote rather than a majority of those voting. The Wood substitute has met both of these criticisms and proposes to do away with the union-shop authorization election entirely. Thus under the Wood substitute, labor organizations will be able to negotiate union-shop contracts without specific prior authorization of the employees involved.

Second, leaders of organized labor both in the Senate hearings and in the

House hearings, as well as in the press, have been very critical of the union-shop provisions of the present law which make nonpayment of dues the sole ground on which unions can demand the discharge of an employee who has been expelled from the union. They have pointed out that it is illogical for the Taft-Hartley Act to attempt to make unions liable in damages for breach of their contracts, while at the same time denying to them the only means that they have of disciplining members who engage in strikes and other activities in violation of union contracts. Moreover, unions have pointed out that even if they expelled a member because he is a Communist, they still cannot compel the employer to discharge that individual. Both of these criticisms of the existing law are met in the Wood substitute, and the Wood substitute specifically authorizes unions to compel the discharge of employees who have been expelled from the union for engaging in wildcat strikes and employees who have been expelled from the union for being members of the Communist Party or other subversive organizations.

I might add by way of interpolation, Mr. Speaker, that the statement made by the American Federation of Labor in its analysis of the Wood bill so far as this particular provision is concerned contained a number of complete misstatements of fact.

Third. Union leaders have contended that the present law completely outlawed the union hiring hall and prohibited an employer from recruiting workers through a union hiring hall. In connection with this criticism they have pointed out that the union hiring hall has been established and utilized for years in various industries and that the Taft-Hartley Act had the effect of disrupting this long-established institution. The Wood substitute meets this criticism by providing that it is not to be considered an unfair labor practice for an employer to notify a union hiring hall when he has jobs to be filled.

Fourth. Labor union leaders have presented much testimony designed to show that the secondary boycott provisions of existing laws are unfair, because they require union members to "scab"—as unions call it—on their own brother members. The Wood substitute meets this criticism by permitting employees in the same local to strike against goods being produced for the account of an employer against whom other members of the local are striking.

Fifth. Labor union leaders have pointed out that under the present law if employees strike in violation of or in disregard of the requirement that unions give 60 days' notice of their intention to negotiate changes in contracts, the employees lose all of their rights under the act, whereas if employers disregard or violate such notice requirements they are not penalized in any way. The Wood substitute abolishes this apparent disparity of treatment between employees and employers.

Sixth. One provision of the present law against which the leaders of organized labor directed particular criticism is the provision stating that employees on strike who are not eligible to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote in representation elections. These leaders contended that this provision coupled with other provisions of the act could be used by employers to bust unions. The Wood substitute meets this criticism made by union leaders, and specifically provides that employees on strike can vote in representation elections if they have not been validly replaced for 90 days or more by a permanent replacement. Thus under the Wood substitute an employer would not be able to bust a union by employing strikebreakers rather than bona fide employees to replace strikers.

Seventh. Union leaders criticized the Communist disclaimer provisions of the present law on the ground that it was unfair to apply such provisions to them and not impose the same requirements on employers. The Wood substitute meets this criticism by requiring that officers of employers as well as officers of labor organizations file affidavits disclaiming Communist affiliation as a condition of being able to invoke the act.

Eighth. Labor organizations very severely criticized the provisions of the present law which compel the general counsel of the Board to apply for injunctions against unions in secondary-boycott cases and contain no provision for mandatory injunctions against employers. The Wood substitute meets this criticism by abolishing the mandatory injunction and giving the general counsel discretion to apply for temporary injunctions either against employers or unions whenever he thinks that it is necessary to do so to prevent irreparable injury.

Ninth. Labor-union leaders were extremely critical of the provisions of the present law that required an election to be held among employees on the employer's last offer in disputes involving the national health and safety.

In one case the union directed its members to boycott such an election, and as a result no votes were cast whatsoever. The Wood substitute meets this criticism of the existing law by abolishing the election on the employer's last offer.

These proposed changes I have enumerated which are made by the Wood substitute are all made in a sincere effort to meet justified union criticism of the present law and to achieve an evenly balanced labor-management policy. All of the changes are important. There are doubtless other changes that Members of this body will wish to propose. I want to emphasize again that any change or changes in the present law can be proposed, using the Wood substitute as a vehicle. And I also want to emphasize that virtually no change in the present law except outright repeal of every last provision can be made using the Lesinski bill as a vehicle.

There is one criticism of the present law that union leaders have made which is met only partially by the Wood substitute. Union leaders violently oppose all provisions authorizing injunctions against union activities, whatever they may be and whatever form they may take. With the present power of unions, it is not possible to do away with injunctions entirely and still protect the public interest. Even the Lesinski bill provides for injunctions against labor unions in secondary-boycott cases and jurisdictional strikes, so the Lesinski bill itself recognizes the need for the injunctive remedy. The Wood substitute continues, however, a provision of the existing law which the Lesinski bill omits—namely, the provision authorizing the President to seek injunctions to protect the national interest when the national health and safety is imperiled. I do not believe that it is in the public interest to do away with this provision of existing law, and I do not think that the abuses of the injunction power in the past, when the injunction was used as a means of enforcing yellow-dog contracts, is any argument for abolishing the injunctive remedy for protecting the public from irreparable damage. The concessions made by the Wood substitute are all in the public interest.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] five additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today we are beginning the consideration of what is probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that we shall have during this Congress. There has been a good deal said about how it was handled in the Labor Committee now and how it was handled in the Labor Committee when the Taft-Hartley bill was under consideration, about arbitrary conduct, and so forth. Well, I am not concerned with that. I think my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. PAUL SHAFER, could tell you a little anecdote that would probably explain what is going on and who is doing it. The question that we are to consider is the question of the merits of this measure.

Now, the Committee on Rules has granted an open rule for the consideration of this bill, and by an understanding and agreement before the rule was reported, when the first section of the Lesinski bill is read, it will be in order and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] will offer as a substitute for that bill the so-called Wood bill. That is going to give the Members of this House the opportunity to vote on the two philosophies of labor legislation, one represented by the old National Labor Relations Act which, by pressure of public opinion over the years, was repudiated 2 years ago. The Lesinski bill restores all of the evils of the old National Labor Relations Act. The Wood bill is based upon the theory of the Taft-Hartley Act and will give those of you who were in the Eightieth Congress and voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, and who constitute a majority of the present membership of this House, an opportunity of voting on the Wood bill to decide whether you were wrong then or whether you are wrong now. So, this method presents to you the two theories of labor legislation, and I want, in these brief few moments that I have, to tell you something about what the various bills do.

I want you to know that if you vote against substituting the Wood bill and vote for the Lesinski bill, that there are certain important things that you are repealing that a majority of you voted for 2 years ago. The Lesinski bill will repeal that provision which separated the supervisory forces from the laboring forces in collective bargaining. If you vote for the Lesinski bill you will vote to repeal the free-speech clause contained in the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act, strange as it may seem, reiterates the constitutional provision that everybody shall have the right of free speech. Before that an employer could not say a word to his employee about labor relations.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill you vote to repeal the constitutional privilege of free speech.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill, you vote to repeal the action you took 2 years ago in prohibiting secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. The Lesinski bill retains only those prohibitions against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts where they involve a dispute between two labor unions. The broad field of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes is not touched. That is repealed by the Lesinski bill.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill you will be voting to restore the old featherbed practices, namely, the right of a labor union to force an employer to pay for work that is not to be performed. If you believe in that, you vote for the Lesinski bill.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill, you vote to repeal the right of an employer to petition for an election to determine with whom he ought to bargain. That is a surprising thing, but under the National Labor Relations Act two unions can fight interminably over the right to represent the employees in a factory and the employer does not have the right to go before the Labor Board and say, "Have an election and settle this thing so that I can go on in my business." That is what you are going to repeal if you vote for the Lesinski bill.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill, you vote to change what you did 2 years ago relative to the prohibition of the closed shop.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill, you are voting to do away with the Communist oath. The Wood bill makes the Communist oath applicable to both employer and employee, but the Lesinski bill wipes it out. If you do not want an employee to be required to say if he belongs to the Communist Party, you vote for the Lesinski bill.

I think the most important thing you are going to vote on if you vote for the Lesinski bill is the States' rights provision. You all know that recently the Supreme Court has upheld the right of a State to legislate on the closed shop. The Lesinski bill in specific terms reverses the Supreme Court of the United States and says that that decision shall no longer be the law of the land.

Is there anybody here in this age of progress who still believes in something in the nature of States' rights? If you do, when you go back home I want you to explain to your people, those of you who vote for the Lesinski bill, why you voted for a measure that reverses a decision of the Supreme Court which said that your State should have the right to police in these matters.

I think some gentlemen will be embarrassed if they are asked that question when they get back home. Do not forget, whatever you do, the States' rights provision and the repeal of the States' rights provision in the Lesinski bill is the most important and vital thing in this whole bill. You are going to have to explain to somebody, if you vote to say that your State shall not have the right to exercise its police powers in the control of these matters, particularly if you happen to be one of those who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act 2 years ago.

Somebody is going to rise here and tell you, "Don't take the Wood bill. That is not the way to do this thing. We are going to take the Lesinski bill and then we are going to amend it off the face of the earth, so nobody will know what it looks like, and we are going to give you a lot of things like the protection the Wood bill is going to give you in strikes endangering the national health and welfare.

That is the next most important thing. If you vote for the Lesinski bill you vote to take away the power of your Government and the power of your President to prevent strikes in emergencies that affect the health and the welfare of the American people. Do you want to vote for that?

They are going to say, "Oh, no, we are going to amend the Lesinski bill." Well, they did not amend the Lesinski bill in the committee, and you do not find anything about it in the Lesinski bill as presented here.

Many of these Members making this argument are going to vote against giving the President of the United States any such right. But the Lesinski bill is so formed and so phrased, that I challenge anyone to get up on the floor of the House and tell us how you can amend the Lesinski bill. I studied both bills. Read the Lesinski bill and tell me how you would ever manage to amend that bill so as to put back into it the features necessary for the protection of the general public—not for the protection of labor unions, and not for the protection of corporations, but for the protection of your people back home. Will someone stand up and tell me how the Lesinski bill can be amended so as to put those features in it? It just cannot be done. Take my word for it.

Those are the questions you are going to have to determine and are going to have to decide for yourself. But do not get fooled on the idea that you can vote down the Wood bill and then ever get a bill in this House that is going to protect the rights of your people and protect the rights of your States, and the rights of the workingman. Let me say something to you. Let me say—and you all probably know it—you can talk all you want about the Taft-Hartley law, but the Taft-Hartley law has more in it for the protection of the workingman, for the protection of the man who wears the overalls than all the other legislation that has ever been proposed by these fellows who stand up here and say, "We are all for labor."

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. HARRIS]. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to discuss the details of the so-called Lesinski bill or the details of the substitute bill which is going to be proposed, nor to any considerable degree, the details of the Taft-Hartley law, which is still on the statute books. You will all agree with me, I am sure, that we are facing here in the House of Representatives an exceedingly important issue. The country is watching us. I am sure that the average citizen is hoping and praying for a just solution of a most difficult problem. I cannot boast of being versed in the law, not having been admitted to the bar; but it occurred to me several years ago at the time when the original Wagner Labor-Relations Act was passed, that with the passage of that act labor unions were for the first time, if I am correct in my recollection, given definite recognition by Federal statute. They were given statutory recognition, which extended to them the right of collective bargaining. Of course, in extending that right, there was imposed, in a sense, upon the employer the duty of cooperating with the union in collective bargaining. In any event, I think I am not far wrong in saying, that by that act the Congress of the United States clothed organized labor unions with a public interest, just as Congress and State legislatures from time to time have clothed other organizations with a public interest by recognizing them under statutory authority. So today, unless I am very much mistaken, the labor union is literally clothed with a public interest. May I try to point out to you, inadequately I am afraid, the situation which existed, let us say, in 1946. A dispute would break out between management and labor in a huge industry. All the work in that industry ceased as a result.

The representatives of management and the leaders of the labor unions involved met in a hotel in some great city, like Chicago or New York or even Washington, and began to discuss and argue amongst themselves as to what they were willing to do and what they were not willing to do. A crowd begins to gather on the street outside, small at first, perhaps impelled by curiosity, waiting to see what this little group of men, perhaps not exceeding 8 or 10 in number, decide upon with respect to what they are going to do about a great industry.

As the days go by the crowd increases, gazing furtively up at the fourth-floor windows, wondering where they are going to get their food tomorrow; wondering perhaps when they will get their clothing, and the thing goes on and on and on until the crowd represents nearly the whole people of the United States.

That was the situation, as I view it, which we faced in 1946—a lack of a

sense of responsibility on the part of those clothed with the public interest. So, an honest effort was made in 1947 to equalize that burden of responsibility between the two parties to the end that they would be conscious of the fact that they owe a responsibility to the country as a whole which overtops their responsibility to their respective groups.

Men have said that as a result of that effort in 1947 to balance the burden of responsibility between the two groups and to bear in mind the vital interest of the public which was standing in that street in ever-increasing numbers labor has lost ground; that labor unions have been weakened; that their life has been threatened.

Mr. Speaker, since 1947 the membership of labor unions has increased tremendously. Numerically they are more powerful today than they ever were, and, believe it or not, I rejoice in that. I am glad to see labor unions increasing in membership. Other things being equal, that is a healthy thing. Again, it has been said that the act of 1947 would cause a great increase in strikes. It had exactly the opposite effect, a marked decrease in strikes. And then, strange to say, in view of the dire prophesies made with respect to the act of 1947, the wages of the workingman, according to the statistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics have gone up literally a little higher proportionately than the cost of living. So that today the hourly wage of the average American workingman purchases more goods than it ever has in the history of the United States. And I rejoice in that, also.

Do I contend that conditions are perfect? No, I do not. I merely cite some of these uncontrovertible facts to show that the act of 1947 has had no tragic consequences whatsoever.

But coming back to my original creed, it is this: that as we legislate here today let us at least, for 2 or 3 days, forget the special interest of one group or the special interest of another group, be they management or be they labor. We must remember the overweening interest of the public; for, I can assure you that the public does not want to return to the conditions that confronted it in 1946 with that crowd in the street waiting for the group of dictators, management and labor leaders, to decide how they, the great American public, shall live.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] talk about the so-called Wood bill, I was forced to believe that what he was talking about, in plain words, was the Taft-Hartley bill.

As I understand the strategy, you will not have any chance to vote on the Lesinski bill; you will have a chance to vote on the Wood bill if it is accepted after the enacting clause is stricken. They expect to go along offering amendments to the Wood bill and trying to make that bill satisfactory to the membership.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And everyone who advocated that has always advocated antilabor legislation in past years in this body.

Mr. KELLEY. That is correct; since I have been here that has been true.

Ostensibly we are going to consider the bill, H. R. 2032, to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes. At this point I think it would be well to analyze the provisions of the bill, H. R. 2032.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 2032

Section 101 repeals the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Act.

Section 102 reenacts the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, commonly known as the Wagner Act, as it existed prior to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The various subsequent sections of the bill amend the Wagner Act, along the lines long advocated by the President and to which the Democratic Party committed itself before the last election. The Thomas-Lesinski bill is thus designed to carry out the pledges made by the President and by the Democratic Party. I will now take up one by one the various amendments of the Wagner Act.

Section 103 continues the present National Labor Relations Board as a five-member tribunal, instead of the three-member tribunal provided for under section 3 (a) of the Wagner Act. The heavy volume of work and the large backlog of cases now on the Board's docket necessitated the continuation of the larger Board. Provision is also made for the continued use of the present panel system, by an amendment of section 3 (b) of the Wagner Act.

Section 104 (2) amends section 4 (a) of the Wagner Act as follows: The salaries of Board members are increased to $17,500 a year. The salary of a Board member under the Taft-Hartley Act is $12,000 per year. The increase is to take into account the rise in living costs, and to give the members of the Board salaries commensurate with the importance of their functions.

Section 104 (b) is a purely technical provision deleting from the Wagner Act a provision with regard to the old NIRA Labor Board.

Section 105 bars the National Labor Relations Board and the courts from taking any action in cases arising under title I of the Taft-Hartley Act unless such action could be taken under the new act with respect to cases occurring after the passage of this bill. It thus modifies the provisions of the General Savings Act of February 25, 1871, which saves pending causes of action in cases of repeal of legislation. Section 105 also prohibits the Labor Board from issuing complaints on unfair labor practices occurring prior to August 22, 1947, unless charges with respect thereto were pending before the Board before January 1, 1949.

Section 106 adds to the Wagner Act provisions dealing with certain types of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes. These additions may be summarized as follows:

Section 106 (a) is of an introductory character. It is a general finding that unjustifiable conflicts between labor organizations lead to industrial strife, and that the public interest requires abatement of such strife.

Section 106 (b) defines "secondary boycott" and "jurisdictional dispute."

Secondary boycott is defined as a concerted refusal to handle a particular product because the product has been or is to be manufactured, produced, or distributed by another employer.

Jurisdictional dispute is defined as a dispute between two or more labor organizations concerning the assignment of work by an employer. Under this definition, jurisdictional dispute is limited to a controversy between two or more labor organizations. It does not include a dispute between a union and an unorganized group of employees or between a union and an employer over the employer's assignment of work to unorganized employees. The definition thus avoids one of the objectionable features of the jurisdictional-dispute provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act—section 8 (b) (4) (D)—which was not limited in its application to disputes of labor organizations. The Taft-Hartley provision could be used by an employer to undermine a labor organization by transferring work from organized to unorganized employees.

It is intended that the term "jurisdictional dispute" shall include only disputes over the assignment of work and not representation cases which involve competition between rival unions for recognition as the bargaining agent for the same group of employees. Representation cases do not involve a dispute over the right to perform particular work, and are more appropriately resolved by an election than by arbitration.

Section 106 (c) amends section 8 of the Wagner Act by making it an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to assign a particular work task in accordance with an award made in a jurisdictional-dispute case under section 106 (e) of the bill. This unfair labor practice is thus designed to implement enforcement of the awards provided for in section 106 (e).

Section 106 (d) amends the Wagner Act by adding to section 8 of that act provisions for unfair labor practices by labor organizations. These provisions make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to engage in a secondary boycott or a strike for the purpose, first, of compelling an employer to violate his statutory obligation to bargain with another labor organization; or second, to further a jurisdictional dispute.

The first of these situations is covered by a provision making it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to engage in a secondary boycott or a strike to compel an employer to bargain in any one of three situations: First, where an-

other labor organization has been certified by the Labor Board and such certification is still in effect; second, where the employer is required by an order of the Board to bargain with another labor organization; or third, where another labor organization, although uncertified, has a valid and subsisting collective-bargaining agreement which at the time of the strike or boycott would constitute a bar to the raising of a question concerning representation.

The purpose of this provision is to protect certifications and orders of the Board determining the status of a bargaining representative, and to safeguard the employer from pressure by a rival union when he is dealing with the majority representative of his employees as required by law.

Section 106 (d) also makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to engage in a secondary boycott or a strike for the purpose of compelling an employer to assign a particular work task contrary to an award made pursuant to the arbitration provisions of the bill. This provision, like the parallel provision of 106 (c) which applies to employers, serves to implement that portion of the bill providing for the arbitration of jurisdictional disputes.

Section 106 (e) sets forth the procedure for the arbitration of jurisdictional disputes. It amends section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 by the addition of these provisions.

The procedure for the arbitration of jurisdictional disputes may be invoked by either an interested labor union or an employer when a secondary boycott or a strike is in effect or threatened. The bill authorized the Board either to hear and determine the jurisdictional dispute itself or to appoint an arbitrator. The award of the arbitrator is to be given the same effect.

Whether the dispute is to be heard by the Board itself or by the arbitrator, opportunity must first be afforded the parties to settle the dispute themselves. Emphasis is thus placed upon voluntary adjustment.

Standards for the determination of the work-assignment issue are set forth in the bill. These include prior Board certifications, union charters or interunion agreements, decisions of agencies established by unions to consider the jurisdictional disputes, the past work history of the contending labor organizations, and the policy of the act. By the inclusion of these standards it is sought to give the Board or the arbitrator adequate statutory guidance, and to avoid the charge made with respect to the jurisdictional-dispute provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act—section 10 (k)—which contain no standards, that they are an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power.

This section permits the Board to treat the case as one involving a petition for an election under section 9 (e) if at any stage of the proceeding it appears that the dispute is not a jurisdictional one but one concerning representation.

It is intended that, in any derivative unfair-labor-practice case, the award made pursuant to the provisions of this section of the bill shall generally be determinative of the work task assignment issue. This procedure is patterned after present procedure in representative cases and refusal to bargain cases, in which the prior certification is ordinarily decisive of the representation issue in the derivative unfair-labor-practice case. It has the advantage of limiting issues and expediting the decision in the subsequent unfair-labor-practice case. This is covered by section 106 (f).

That concludes the treatment of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes.

Section 107 amends the proviso to section 8 (a) (3) of the Wagner Act to make it clear that the Federal statute overrides State laws which prohibit or restrict the closed shop or the check-off of union dues. These are matters which, except in the case of purely local enterprises, manifestly require uniform treatment on a national basis. There is no conceivable reason why a union dealing with the United States Steel Corp. should be permitted to negotiate for a closed shop and check-off in Pennsylvania but be denied that right by State law in some other State. Nor should the State be encouraged or permitted to bid for the location of industry within their borders by adopting repressive antilabor legislation. A major reason for the creation of the United States and for the adoption of the Constitution was to guarantee that the country would constitute an economic unit, with matters affecting interstate commerce being handled on a national and uniform basis. Section 107 secures this uniformity in the case of labor relations, and places such matters as the closed shop and the check-off in the area of free collective bargaining between labor and management.

Section 108 makes it an unfair labor practice for either an employer or a labor organization to terminate or modify existing agreements except upon 30 days' advance notice to the United States Conciliation Service. This requirement will enable the service to be apprised in advance of situations which may develop into industrial conflict.

We now come to title II of the bill. This title provides for the reestablishment of the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor. This step, our committee concluded, is necessary for a sound and properly coordinated administration of Government-labor functions.

Section 201 reestablishes the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor, and contains certain provisions to its administration.

Section 202 describes the functions of the Service and permits the Director to intervene in any labor dispute when, in his judgment, such intervention would assist the parties in settling the dispute. The Director is authorized, however, to enter into agreement with State and local mediation agencies relating to the mediation of disputes whose effects are predominantly local in character.

Section 203 prescribes conduct of the conciliation officers.

Section 204 declares that it is the duty of employers and employees to exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain collective-bargaining agreements and to participate fully in meetings called by the Service to aid in settling disputes. The purpose of these provisions is to emphasize the importance of peaceful and voluntary methods of adjusting industrial disputes.

The same policy underlies section 205 which declares it to be the public policy of the United States that collective-bargaining agreements shall provide for the arbitration of disputes growing out of their interpretation. The Conciliation Service is directed to assist in developing procedures for arbitration, in framing issues, and in selecting arbitrators. The provisions of this section are intended to encourage resort to the process of voluntary arbitration.

Section 206 provides for the appointment of labor-management advisory committees to advise the Secretary of Labor on questions of policy and administration affecting work of the Service.

We come now to title III of the bill which deals with national emergencies resulting from strikes in vital industries. The provisions of title III are intended to provide a method by which the Government can effectively assist in the settlement of such controversies. It is contemplated that the procedures provided are to be used only in exceptional cases involving a grave national emergency.

Section 301 provides that whenever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists because of a stoppage of work in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect.

Section 302 provides for the appointment by the President of an emergency board. This board is required to make its report to the President within 25 days after he issues his proclamation. This section, unlike the Taft-Hartley Act, requires the board to make findings and recommendations. The bill thus makes it possible to secure from a group of impartial experts findings and opinions upon the basis of which an informed opinion can be reached. It is believed that the rallying of public opinion behind such recommendations will be a powerful factor in settling such disputes.

The section prescribes a total cooling-off period of 30 days; 25 days during which the emergency Loard is making its investigation and report, plus 5 days after the report has been submitted. The bill does not provide for enforcement of this waiting period by injunction, but both of the great labor organizations have pledged themselves to observe it. It will be recalled that a much broader no-strike pledge during the war worked very well indeed.

Section 303 grants the emergency boards the necessary powers to carry out their duties, and carries administrative provisions.

That completes the major provisions of the bill. Title IV contains various miscellaneous provisions.

Section 401 is declaratory of what the law would be anyway, and makes it clear that the prohibitions in the Norris-LaGuardia and the Clayton Acts against the issuance of labor injunctions are restored in full force.

Section 402 restores the political-contributions provision of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act as it existed prior to the War Labor Disputes Act by striking from the Federal Corrupt Practices Act provisions relating to labor organizations.

Section 403 defines certain terms which are used throughout the bill.

Section 404 makes it clear that no provision of the act is to be construed as compelling an employee to render forced labor or to work under abnormally dangerous conditions.

Section 405 provides that titles II and III shall not be applicable with respect to matters which are subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. It is not necessary to include title I in this exclusion since the definition of "employer" in title I has the same effect.

Section 406 contains the usual separability provision.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has 8 minutes remaining. No time remains on the other side.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for so much of the 8 minutes as he may consume.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to correct an impression left by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. Listening to the gentleman from Virginia one would believe that the Wood bill was a piece of legislation that had been before the House for some time and with which every Member was familiar. The Wood bill—and I do not know yet whether the gentleman from Virginia was referring to the Wood bill that was filed first or the Wood bill that was filed the day before we adjourned for the Easter recess.

The first Wood bill was supposed to be the bill that was going to bring out the recommendations of the watchdog committee. I am going to make a statement now, and I do not think it can be contradicted. I hold in my hand the bill H. R. 4290 which is the new Wood bill. I received this bill about 3 hours ago. It is made up of 67 printed pages. I say that there are not 20 Members of Congress who have read or know what is in the second Wood bill, yet we are going to be asked to substitute this piece of legislation for H. R. 2032 which has been pending in Congress since January 3.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I regret that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] did not yield to me while he had the floor. I wanted to ask him about Wood bill No. 2 which he said preserves States' rights. While that is true in regard to any State forbidding the closed shop as provided in section 14 (b); section 14 (a) definitely strikes down States' rights in these words: "No employer subject to this act shall be compelled to deem individuals defined herein as supervisors as employees for the purpose of any law, either national or local, relating to collective bargaining."

I wanted to ask the gentleman from Virginia to explain to me what became of his regard for States' rights when they wrote section 14 (a).

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman from Indiana that I do not like that provision either. However, I did not write the Wood bill and I suggest that he offer an amendment to strike that out and I will go along with him.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Virginia was very enthusiastic about the fact that the Wood bill outlaws the so-called closed shop.

I have in my hand an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune in October 1947. I am sure my friends on the left side of this House will certainly listen attentively to what the Chicago Tribune has to say about the closed shop. The Chicago Tribune and all newspapers in the Chicago area have been tied up in a paralyzing strike for 18 months. Thousands of members of the printers' union have been without work for that period of time and millions of dollars have been lost.

Here is what the "world's greatest newspaper" says about the closed shop which the Wood bill seeks to retain:

"When the law was under discussion in Congress, as our readers will recall, we advised against outlawing the closed shop. We did so, among other reasons, because we knew that the closed shop worked well in our own plant and had worked well for half a century or more. Congress did not take our advice. Neither the Tribune nor the Typographical Union writes laws of this country."

Somebody is going to have to explain to the Chicago Tribune if this Wood bill is accepted as is. However, our old friend, Curley Brooks, is out in Illinois and has plenty of time to explain to the Chicago Tribune just what the Taft-Hartley Act did to him.

My friends, I want to call another fact to the attention of the House. You remember when our good friend, Fred Hartley, the former chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, closed debate 2 years ago on the Taft-Hartley law, his closing words in asking for votes on the Taft-Hartley legislation, before the vote was taken were, "Remember," he said, "if you vote for this bill you will have John L. Lewis in a box." Well, John L. Lewis has been in everybody's hair several times since the Taft-Hartley Act has been passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Hartley also said in his closing remarks that there is more in this bill, the Taft-Hartley bill, than meets the eye.

Mr. MADDEN. That is right, and over 61,000,000 wage earners in America, and about 16,000,000 union members have discovered most of the hidden booby-traps and concealed antilabor restrictions since that time, and that is why the Eighty-first Congress was elected to repeal that act. Yes, they took John L. Lewis out of a box. During one of his strikes, he was ushered into a conference, with our good friend, the present minority leader, who was then Speaker and the distinguished Senator BRIDGES. These three arbitrators settled the strike in 10 minutes, but the Taft-Hartley Act had nothing to do with that.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] stated that the labor unions have increased their membership. Why, the greatest membership I ever saw in a union hall in my district was after those good old years of Republican depression back in 1934–35. Then the union members and the wage earners knew that they must get together and organize so that another depression, with its unemployment and low wages would not strike this country. We had great gatherings in the union halls back in 1934, 1935, and 1936 when wage earners started to organize in order to increase wages and improve working conditions in America. The big mistake labor made is that they went to sleep in 1946, and thought that they had won their battle, but they did not figure on the Eightieth Congress. That is why labor-union membership is increasing in 1948 because they are going to repeal and undo the damage done by the Eightieth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 369, nays 6, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—369

Abbitt	Beckworth	Buckley, N. Y.
Abernethy	Bennett, Fla.	Burdick
Addonizio	Bentsen	Burke
Albert	Biemiller	Burleson
Allen, Calif.	Bishop	Burnside
Allen, Ill.	Blackney	Burton
Andersen, H. Carl	Bland	Byrne, N. Y.
	Blatnik	Byrnes, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs, Del.	Camp
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, La.	Canfield
	Bolling	Cannon
Angell	Bolton, Md.	Carlyle
Arends	Bonner	Carnahan
Aspinall	Bosone	Carroll
Auchincloss	Boykin	Case, N. J.
Bailey	Bramblett	Case, S. Dak.
Barden	Breen	Cavalcante
Baring	Brehm	Celler
Barrett, Pa.	Brown, Ga.	Chatham
Barrett, Wyo.	Brown, Ohio	Chelf
Bates, Mass.	Bryson	Chesney
Battle	Buchanan	Chiperfield
Beall	Buckley, Ill.	Christopher

Chudoff	Javits	Pfeiffer,
Church	Jenkins	William L.
Clemente	Jennings	Philbin
Cole, Kans.	Jensen	Phillips, Calif.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson	Phillips, Tenn.
Colmer	Jonas	Pickett
Combs	Jones, Ala.	Poage
Cooley	Jones, Mo.	Polk
Cooper	Jones, N. C.	Potter
Corbett	Karst	Poulson
Cotton	Karsten	Powell
Coudert	Kean	Preston
Crawford	Kearns	Price
Crook	Keating	Priest
Crosser	Kee	Quinn
Cunningham	Keefe	Rabaut
Dague	Kelley	Rains
Davenport	Kennedy	Ramsay
Davis, Ga.	Keogh	Rankin
Davis, Wis.	Kerr	Redden
Dawson	Kilburn	Reed, N. Y.
Deane	Kilday	Rees
Delaney	King	Regan
Denton	Kirwan	Rhodes
D'Ewart	Klein	Ribicoff
Dingell	Kruse	Riehlman
Dollinger	Lane	Rivers
Dolliver	Lanham	Rodino
Dondero	Larcade	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	Latham	Rogers, Mass.
Doughton	LeFevre	Rooney
Douglas	Lemke	Sadlak
Doyle	Lesinski	Sadowski
Durham	Lichtenwalter	Sanborn
Eaton	Lind	Sasscer
Eberharter	Linehan	Scott, Hardie
Elliott	Lodge	Scott,
Ellsworth	Lovre	Hugh D., Jr.
Elston	Lucas	Scrivner
Engle, Calif.	Lyle	Scudder
Evins	Lynch	Secrest
Fallon	McCarthy	Shafer
Feighan	McConnell	Sheppard
Fellows	McCormack	Short
Fenton	McCulloch	Sikes
Fernandez	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Fisher	McGrath	Simpson, Pa.
Flood	McGregor	Sims
Fogarty	McGuire	Smith, Va.
Forand	McKinnon	Smith, Wis.
Ford	McMillan, S. C.	Spence
Fulton	McMillen, Ill.	Staggers
Furcolo	McSweeney	Stanley
Gary	Mack, Ill.	Steed
Gathings	Mack, Wash.	Stefan
Gavin	Madden	Stigler
Gillette	Magee	Sullivan
Golden	Mahon	Sutton
Gordon	Mansfield	Taber
Gorski, Ill.	Marsalis	Tackett
Gorski, N. Y.	Marshall	Talle
Graham	Martin, Iowa	Tauriello
Granahan	Martin, Mass.	Teague
Granger	Mason	Thomas, Tex.
Grant	Merrow	Thornberry
Green	Meyer	Tollefson
Gross	Michener	Towe
Gwinn	Miles	Trimble
Hagen	Miller, Calif.	Underwood
Hale	Miller, Md.	Van Zandt
Hall,	Miller, Nebr.	Velde
Leonard W.	Mills	Vinson
Halleck	Mitchell	Vorys
Hand	Monroney	Vursell
Harden	Morgan	Wadsworth
Hardy	Morris	Wagner
Hare	Morrison	Walter
Harris	Morton	Weichel
Harrison	Moulder	Welch, Calif.
Harvey	Murdock	Welch, Mo.
Havenner	Murray, Tenn.	Werdel
Hays, Ohio	Nelson	Wheeler
Hébert	Nixon	White, Calif.
Heffernan	Noland	Whitten
Herlong	Norrell	Whittington
Herter	Norton	Wigglesworth
Heselton	O'Brien, Ill.	Williams
Hinshaw	O'Brien, Mich.	Willis
Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Okla.
Holifield	O'Neill	Wilson, Tex.
Holmes	O'Sullivan	Winstead
Hope	O'Toole	Withrow
Horan	Pace	Wolcott
Howell	Passman	Wolverton
Huber	Patman	Wood
Hull	Patten	Woodhouse
Irving	Patterson	Woodruff
Jackson, Calif.	Perkins	Worley
Jackson, Wash.	Peterson	Yates
Jacobs	Pfeifer,	Young
James	Joseph L.	Zablocki

NAYS—6

Nicholson	Rich	Smith, Kans.
Norblad	St. George	Wier

NOT VOTING—56

Allen, La.	Goodwin	Marcantonio
Andrews	Gore	Multer
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Murphy
Bennett, Mich.	Gregory	Murray, Wis.
Bolton, Ohio	Hall,	O'Konski
Brooks	Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Bulwinkle	Hart	Reed, Ill.
Clevenger	Hays, Ark.	Richards
Cox	Hedrick	Sabath
Curtis	Heller	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	Hill	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.	Hobbs	Stockman
DeGraffenried	Hoeven	Taylor
Engel, Mich.	Jenison	Thomas, N. J.
Frazier	Judd	Thompson
Fugate	Kearney	Walsh
Gamble	Kunkel	Whitaker
Garmatz	LeCompte	White, Idaho
Gilmer	Macy	Wickersham

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs—

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Marcantonio with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Fugate with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Moulter with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Murphy with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Thompson with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. SHAFER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2032, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I want to make clear at the outset of this debate—we of the majority present this measure in no spirit of partisanship, nor with any purpose of reprisal.

We are not interested in repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the enactment of sound, substantial labor-management relations merely because the Taft-Hartley Act was a Republican measure and was driven through the Congress in a spirit of hysteria and vengeance. We are not here seeking to play politics, or to curry favor with any group.

And I appeal to the members of the House on both sides of the aisle to approach this debate in that same spirit of fair-mindedness, determined as always to legislate in the interests of our entire country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 2032, is conceived in that spirit. I believe that it is one of the most vital measures that will come before this Congress.

It deals with one of the most vital relationships that exists today in our society—the relationship between labor and management and the public.

If we are to achieve a stable society, if we are to avoid the bitternesses and conflicts of class warfare, we must deal wisely with this relationship between labor, management, and the public for it is one upon which many governments in our time have floundered.

We have seen the breach between these three vital elements of our community widened and widened until, at times, it threatened to plunge us into the bottomless pit of anarchy. We have seen proponents of class hatred—on the side of labor and on the side of management—seize upon each and every opportunity to put shackles and chains upon the other.

That was the spirit, Mr. Chairman, that motivated the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was that spirit, Mr. Chairman, that was the driving force behind those who, in the Eightieth Congress, whipped up the frenzy and the hatred against labor organizations that are expressed in that act. And it was on the coat-tails of that frenzy and that hatred that the Taft-Hartley Act rode to passage.

The President of the United States, Mr. Chairman, was well aware of this when he returned the Taft-Hartley Act to the Congress without his approval.

At that time he declared—and I quote from his veto message:

> The bill taken as a whole would reserve the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come.

The President also noted, Mr. Chairman, that this bill—and again I give you the very words—

> would go far toward weakening our trade-union movement. And it would go far toward destroying our national unity. By raising barriers between labor and management and by injecting political considerations into normal economic decisions, it would invite them to gain their ends through direct political action. I think it would be extremely dangerous to our country to develop a class basis for political action.

I cannot emphasize too strongly—

The President continued—

the importance of the United States in the world today as a force for freedom and peace.

We cannot be strong internationally if our national duty and our productive strength are hindered at home. Anything which weakens our economy or weakens the unity of our people—as I am thoroughly convinced this bill would do—I cannot approve.

Following that message, Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley Act was put into our great democratic crucible of public debate.

Countless hours of valuable radio time were consumed with discussion and debate. Thousands of columns of newspaper and magazine space were filled with printed words which examined the merits and demerits of the Taft-Hartley Act. On public platforms all over the land speakers expounded their views on the virtues and the faults of this legislation.

And, Mr. Chairman, last November this issue was put squarely before the voters of the Nation.

The platform of the Democratic Party, Mr. Chairman, stated clearly the policy of our party with respect to labor-management relations.

It declared:

We advocate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was enacted by the Republican Eightieth Congress over the President's veto. It has failed. The number of disputes has increased. Recent decisions prove it was poorly drawn and probably, in some provisions, unconstitutional.

The platform of the Republican Party, Mr. Chairman, was also clear in its support of the Taft-Hartley Act. It termed it a "sensible reform" of the labor law.

The candidates for President spoke even more plainly. The President openly and on numerous occasions voiced his opposition to the Taft-Hartley law and his desire for sound, well-considered legislation covering labor-management-public relations. The Republican candidate for President made it equally clear that he was standing by the Taft-Hartley law.

And on November 2, 1948, Mr. Chairman, the people of the Nation gave their great decision. After months of debate, after more than a year's experience, after a public scrutiny of the law that was detailed and painstaking, the voters of the Nation expressed their opinion.

They put their approval on the candidate and the party who stood for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and for the enactment of sound legislation in this field.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that by taking this action the people of our country took a great step forward, not only in strengthening our own democracy here at home but in strengthening beyond measure the hands of those abroad who preach the cause of democracy.

As the Members of the House know, there are today in Europe growing numbers of working men and women who resist the encroachments and the blandishments of communism. To the lies and propaganda of the Communists and the opponents of democracy, they reply with facts and proof from the United States, the great stronghold of the democratic faith.

The fact that we in this country could plunge so important a piece of legislation as that governing labor-management relationships into the crucible of democratic debate was itself impressive. The fact that out of this crucible we can pour a revised measure that will eliminate the evils and shortcomings of that legislation will be even more impressive.

It is, Mr. Chairman, a demonstration that democracy can work and does work.

If we break faith with the people of our own country, we do more than destroy the precious fabric of our own democratic faith. We rip to shreds the painful and expensive beginnings that we of the democratic faith are today making in western Europe. If we break faith with our own people—who expressed themselves so clearly and in such detail last November—we confess to the people of western Europe who are today desperately seeking the truth that the forces of communism speak the truth, while we practice hypocrisy.

I know that this House will not make such a confession. I know that this House will keep the faith of our own people and of the people in other lands who look to us to keep the torch of democracy always lighted.

Weakening the rights of labor and taking away its strength to bargain collectively, as the Taft-Hartley Act does, is the first step away from democracy, and toward fascism, communism or any other brand of totalitarianism. If we are to continue leading the countries who look to us for guidance, we must not only preach democracy, we must be a democracy. And in a democracy, the rights of labor must be respected.

The President of the United States took steps toward the fulfillment of our pledges to democracy and the democratic faith at the first opportunity.

In his message to this body on the state of the Union on January 5 of this year, he declared:

If we want to keep our economy running in high gear, we must make sure that every group has the incentive to make its full contribution to the national welfare. At present the working men and women of the Nation are unfairly discriminated against by a statute that abridges their rights, curtails their constructive efforts and hampers our system of free-collective bargaining. That statute is the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, sometimes called the Taft-Hartley Act.

That act should be repealed.

The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited. The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented. Without endangering our democratic freedoms, means should be provided for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.

The Department of Labor should be rebuilt and strengthened and those units properly belonging within that Department should be placed in it.

The bill which our committee has placed before the House carries out those recommendations.

We have listened to days of testimony and we have had the benefit of the even more extensive hearings that were held by the appropriate committee in the other body of this Congress. Every Member of this Congress has had before him for nearly 3 months a copy of this bill which he could read and study.

Every issue was thoroughly explored. Every shade of opinion among management, labor, the farmers, and the public at large was given an opportunity to be heard. The experts in labor law and labor-management relations gave our committee their considered judgment on the legislation now before us.

Against this background, the committee has given careful consideration to the purpose of H. R. 2032, and a majority of the committee has concluded that it is sound legislation and should be passed.

I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, at this time to go into the specific provisions of H. R. 2032. That will be done by the other members of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the House will act upon this measure in the spirit in which it is presented—a spirit of fair play and a consciousness that what we do here with this measure will have an overwhelming effect on the structure and growth of our society here at home and on the painful gropings of people elsewhere in the world toward the creation of a free society composed of freemen and free institutions.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Chairman, that I call upon the House to pass H. R. 2032 without amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I do not yield. The gentleman can get time on his own side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] has consumed 17 minutes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 33 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], who up until this year was a member of the Committee on Labor. The gentleman from Indiana spoke of the procedure used in pushing the Taft-Hartley bill through the committee.

I would like to draw a comparison between the two periods we are discussing, the action of the committee in the Eightieth Congress on the Taft-Hartley bill, and the action of the committee in the Eighty-first Congress on the Lesinski bill.

The full committee in the Eightieth Congress, controlled by the Republicans, held hearings on labor-management problems for approximately 6 weeks. The full committee, I repeat, conducted the hearings. Under the present procedure of this labor committee, the Lesinski bill hearings were held by a subcommittee for approximately 10 days, sandwiched in between voting, and other matters which took our attention.

In the Eightieth Congress, at the end of 6 weeks of hearings and the taking of 2,000,000 words of testimony, the majority members of the committee proceeded to write the bill. No department of Government and no special interest or out-

side organization had anything to do with the bill which was drawn up for this House in the Eightieth Congress by the majority members of the labor committee. After we had finished with our deliberations, which took us approximately 10 days, the bill was brought before the full committee and it was read for amendment. Approximately 29 amendments were adopted, as you will see if you will read the report back in that period.

Now, let us contrast the present situation. Many of us came back to this Congress with the thought that we would have an opportunity to consider in detail and very carefully this critical and important problem. It became obvious to us shortly after we began our hearings before the subcommittee that there was no intention to have the bill changed in any particular. As a result, when it was brought before the subcommittee, and then before the full committee, there was no discussion. When the substitute bill was offered by me, I did not even have any opportunity to explain some of the provisions of that bill and some other amendments which I wished to offer. After that, a vote was taken, the substitute bill was defeated 13–11, and then the Lesinski bill was voted out of the committee with no intervening discussion. The Republican Members went before the Rules Committee and asked for an open rule, one which would permit amendment and allow the bill to be written on the floor of the House.

There has been some question about the use of the name of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], on the bill. As far as I know, it is a very honorable name; I know nothing wrong with the name. It happened to be the only bill to my knowledge that contained the various features of the present labor law so that when it came to the floor of the House it could be considered in an intelligent fashion as a substitute. Certainly there was no intention of getting rid of the names Taft and Hartley that I knew of, but it just happened to be the only bill before the committee conforming to the general pattern of the Taft-Hartley bill, as amended by recommendations of the joint House-Senate committee which was set up by action of the Eightieth Congress.

This is a big piece of legislation we have before us today. We must consider not only the administration bill, the Lesinski bill, but we also have to consider the Taft-Hartley and Wagner Acts, and the Wood bill. It becomes very confusing, undoubtedly, to many people, so I have deliberately set up the program on our side in such way that we can develop the procedure that we believe will be correct; also, that we will be able to tell you the past history of other legislation, as well as what the Lesinski bill does and does not do, and what the Wood bill will do. That will be developed during the course of our discussion in the next 2 days.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. There are a couple of other things that I believe it might be well to have cleared up at this juncture; the first is the reference by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] for whom certainly I have the highest respect and admiration, that the so-called injunctive processes of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 had never been effective against Mr. Lewis and the coal strike. As I remember, it was that very process that was invoked, and it runs in my mind that it was quite effective; at least it resulted in the collection of a fine. The President himself ordered the Attorney General to obtain the injunction.

Secondly, reference was made to the fact that no one knows what is in the revised Wood bill. At this juncture let me say that some days ago I received from the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] a carefully worked out analysis of his bill and the revised Wood bill. I have read it and studied it with interest, and I commend it to the consideration of every Member. All Members undoubtedly also have copies of the comparative analysis. As a matter of fact, I think it should be pointed out that the bill was introduced on April 14.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I think that the RECORD ought clearly to show that the coal strike, if I remember it correctly, was a dispute over the disposition of welfare funds. Three trustees were set up in that particular union; one of the trustees was in favor of the union's distribution of the fund; the operators' trustee was not in favor of it, and the neutral trustee resigned. As a result of this dispute on the conflicting provisions of the contract there was a question as to whether or not there was an actual strike. When John Lewis passed the message back to his people that the operators had violated the provisions of the contract they walked off the job.

It was then, as I recall it, that the gentleman from Indiana as he addressed us from the well of the House said that it was not the injunctive process but it was the present minority leader and a certain Senator who was instrumental in getting a new trustee selected, which new trustee sustained the position of the union. The welfare fund was then disbursed. So, actually, the injunctive process had absolutely nothing to do with the strike itself.

It is true, however, that they fined the union; it is true also that when the case was carried to the district court of appeals the court sustained the union. Of course, the injunctive process was used as a punitive measure.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, it is our intention to present various parts of this labor-management problem. I intended to present here today as the lead-off speaker on the Republican side the general background which preceded the labor-management laws as we are now considering them.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted today with one of the most critical issues with which this Congress will deal. That issue is whether we shall blindly discard in toto every last provision of an act that passed this body less than 2 years ago, with a majority of the Members of both parties voting in favor of it. That is what the majority of the Democratic Members who reported the bill now before us recommend that we do, for that bill would scrap every single provision of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

When the act was passed, no one considered it to be perfect, and no one considered that defects would not develop from experience under it. The Republican minority concedes that defects have developed and that such defects should be corrected. Others will doubtless develop in the future, for the Labor-Management Relations Act is no different from other legislation in this regard.

But the existence of some defects in the present law is in our opinion no justification whatever for discarding all of its provisions—regardless of their merit. It has been the traditional practice of Congress, and of all other legislative bodies, when defects in existing legislation are shown, to formulate specific amendments to correct them. Scarcely a year goes by but what the need of changes in some of the provisions in our revenue laws is not pressed convincingly on Congress. Yet it has never been proposed that because certain tax provisions can be shown to be inequitable or defective we should repeal all of our tax laws. Yet this is the underlying premise of the bill now before us.

In 1947 when the unprecedented industrial chaos of a year and a half which had resulted from the partisan and one-sided administration of the Wagner Act and extreme judicial interpretation of the Norris-LaGuardia Act clamored for the attention of the Eightieth Congress, those of us who served in that body did not begin our task by repealing those statutes. Instead we invited representatives of industry, labor, and the public to appear before our standing committees and give us their views as to what should be done to remedy the situation. The legislation we ultimately passed—the Labor-Management Relations Act—was carefully drawn so as to save all the sound features of the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and so as to supplement those provisions with provisions giving recognition to the fact that management, the public, and the individual worker also have a stake in any sound Federal industrial relations policy. In enacting that legislation we were careful to preserve the very language of the earlier enactments upon which the protection of the right to organize, to bargain collectively, and to engage in concerted activities were embodied.

The Labor-Management Relations Act was not the sole and exclusive invention of the Eightieth Congress. Virtually all of its major provisions had a previous legislative history. Such fundamental reforms in National Labor Relations Board jurisdiction and procedure as the establishment of unfair labor practices for unions as well as management, the right of free speech, the separation of prosecuting and judicial functions, and the application of the rules of evidence and judicial review to Labor Board findings, were embodied in a bill which

passed the House overwhelmingly in the heavily Democratic Seventy-sixth Congress. That bill was the result of the only exhaustive investigation a committee of this Congress has ever made of the actual administration of the Wagner Act.

In the ensuing Seventy-seventh Congress, also heavily Democratic, the House by a big majority passed another bill which also contained a number of provisions which the Taft-Hartley Act ultimately enacted into law, including provisions enabling the Government to obtain temporary injunctions in strikes endangering the national safety. In the rapid developments of the war which followed, this measure, a forerunner in many respects of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, was not acted upon by the other body.

The Seventy-eighth Congress—also Democratic—dealt with labor problems by enacting the Wage Stabilization Act and the Smith-Connally Act. Such measures, of course, with wage fixing and plant seizures, were justified only against the background of wartime conditions.

The expiration of these wartime measures brought forcibly home the grievous results to the public of the long-standing failure of Congress to remedy the inadequacies of the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts. Large and powerful international unions speaking for and controlling all of the workers throughout entire industries were able to paralyze our economy. In the 5-month period which followed the end of the war, reconversion was set back by the loss of approximately 38,000,000 man-days of labor through strikes. This total was tripled in 1946 when 116,000,000 man-days were lost and the number of strikes reached the unprecedented figure of 4,985.

In an attempt to cope with these problems the Seventy-ninth Congress, also strongly Democratic, attempted to curb some of the more flagrant labor abuses by enacting the Case bill.

This measure contained provisions dealing with the compulsory organization of supervisory personnel, contained effective curbs against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, conferred jurisdiction upon the Federal district courts in suits for breach of collective-bargaining agreements, established an independent mediation service, treated certain unjustifiable union practices of a monopoly character as violations of the antitrust laws, and placed restrictions on the unregulated control and expenditure by unions of welfare funds exacted from employers.

As a result of the veto of this bill by the President, the Eightieth Congress was forced to consider anew the problem of dealing with all these abuses as well as with the defects in Labor Board procedure and practice which would have been remedied years before had the other body concurred with the action of the House in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses.

So the Labor-Management Relations Act was truly the culmination of an evolutionary process. I have listened to and read all sorts of arguments against it. Very few of those arguments are directed at specific provisions. They are rather arguments which might have been made with respect to the industrial-relations picture a generation or so ago. When we hear such phrases as "union busting," "government by injunctions," "slave labor," "sweatshops," and "yellow-dog contracts," a person unfamiliar with our present laws would think that we are legislating today against the background of the early 1920's. A person unfamiliar with our present laws would infer that statutes for the protection of the workingman that have been enacted during the last 20 years—such as the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Antistrikebreaker Act—had never been written—or, if they had, that the Eightieth Congress had erased them all from the statute books.

I believe that there are few, if any, Members of this body who would not agree that prior to the enactment of those laws workers who wished to organize and bargain collectively were in many, many cases prevented from doing so and unfairly treated. I believe there are few, if any, Members of this body who would not agree that organized labor in the past had a long and slow uphill battle to secure recognition in law of the right of workers to organize and engage in concerted activities for the purposes of mutual protection. But that right received the protection of law over 15 years ago, is still incorporated in the law today, and was not disturbed by the Labor-Management Relations Act.

In the early days of this century the concerted activities of labor organizations were held to be subject to the antitrust laws, with the result that workers engaged in concerted activities at their peril. Congress attempted to remedy this in the enactment of the Clayton Act in 1914, but the interpretation put upon this act by the courts did not improve the situation. During the 1920's, as a result of the emergence of the yellow-dog contract and the continued application of the antitrust laws, the doctrine that injunctions were an appropriate remedy to prevent workers from engaging in concerted activities came into full flower. That situation was corrected by the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932—and every essential feature of that act is still in effect today.

None of us here looks with pride upon the treatment of organized labor a generation ago. But that is not the situation today, and it is not that situation that we are here legislating about.

All of the acts that I have referred to that have been enacted in the last 20 years for the protection of workers are still intact in all of their essential provisions, and not even the most violent opponent of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, can deny this.

When the bill reported by the committee was the subject of hearings before our subcommittee, not one witness was able to point to a single case of a union being smashed or of a sweatshop or yellow-dog contract being sanctified by the Taft-Hartley Act. Not a scintilla of evidence has been produced to show that any American worker has been enslaved since its passage. On the contrary, during the 2 years the law has been in effect the number of organized workers has steadily increased, the number of strikes has steadily decreased, and the wage scales prevailing in collective-bargaining agreements are higher than at any point in our history.

What the bill before us would have you do would be to blindfold your eyes to the situation that exists today and return to the one-sided laws that were enacted to deal with an entirely different situation. I do not use the words "one-sided" in any critical sense, nor do I for a moment suggest that the National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act did not meet a need for genuine reform at the time that they were passed. In those years more than 10,000,000 persons in our working force were unemployed. Labor organizations had shrunk in membership to less than 2,000,000 and hence were relatively weak and ineffective in protecting the standards and conditions of employment of wage earners. But when the larger part of our factories, mines, and transportation facilities were organized by large and powerful labor unions, the shortcomings in these statutes to deal with the changed picture soon became apparent.

The bill that we have before us would return to all these shortcomings, and this is not because the laws to which the bill would return were bad at the time they were enacted. It is rather because we are today facing an entirely different factual situation than that which existed in 1932 and 1935. But the bill would do even more than merely return to the one-sided Wagner Act. It would go far beyond this. For example, some 21 States have restrictions of one sort or another upon compulsory union-membership agreements. An even larger number of States have restrictions on the check-off. These State laws were never interfered with in any way by the Wagner Act, and yet the bill we have before would erase all of these from State statute books and State constitutions.

It is claimed by the proponents of the bill that the bill is really two-sided, since it provides for certain unfair labor practices by labor unions. Let us examine this claim for a moment. Labor unions, like corporations, can act only through agents. When a person purporting to act for a labor union does something that is unlawful, the question inevitably arises as to whether his act is the act of the labor union so as to make the labor union liable. Under the bill we have before us it will, in practical effect, be impossible to ever hold a labor union liable for an unfair labor practice because the bill makes the ordinary laws of agency inapplicable to labor unions. Instead it would require in effect that the union pass a formal resolution specifically authorizing its officials to engage in illegal activities before a union could be held liable for committing one of the proposed new unfair labor practices.

What the bill proposes to do, however, is not nearly so significant as what it proposes to omit from the present law.

First. All of the provisions of the present law which give to the Government the power to protect itself against the

effects of strikes and lock-outs which imperil the national health and safety would be discarded and the United States left helpless when situations like this arise.

Second. All of the provisions of the present law which protect workers from mass picketing and other organized union violence would be discarded.

Third. All of the reforms made to protect individual workers against arbitrary union action by unions having compulsory union-membership agreements with employers would be scrapped.

Fourth. The bill would discard all of the provisions of the present law which make boycotts having no purpose other than monopoly unlawful.

Fifth. The provisions of existing law protecting the political freedom of individual workers would be scrapped, and the workers, through the combination of compulsory union membership and the check-off of union assessments without the workers' consent, would be compelled to support candidates and doctrines with which they do not agree.

Sixth. The bill would omit the provisions of existing law which protect the right of free speech in labor controversies.

Seventh. It would omit all the provisions of existing law which give to employees a method of getting rid of a union which has lost the employees' majority support.

Eighth. The provisions of existing law imposing on unions a mutual duty to bargain collectively would be omitted.

Ninth. The provisions of existing law which make unions subject to suit like all other persons for violation of contract would be discarded; and, moreover, the bill would even discard the provision of existing law which exempts the property of individual union members from execution to satisfy a judgment against the union.

Tenth. The provisions of existing law which recognize the line between labor and management, and which exempt supervisory personnel from domination by labor unions controlled in fact or in practice by the very personnel which the supervisor has been hired to direct would be scrapped.

Eleventh. The provisions of existing law which enabled the Atomic Energy Commission to protect atomic secrets from Communist labor officials would be completely done away with. As a matter of fact, this bill actually encourages the infiltration of Communists and their leaders into unions and opens the door to complete Communist domination of unions. It sanctions the use of closed-shop for Communist objectives and compels employers engaged in the highly secret operations of the Atomic Energy Commission to bargain and deal with Communist-dominated unions. Therefore, I most earnestly appeal to you, my colleagues, to consider the danger to our national security that could result from the enactment of this labor legislation.

Twelfth. All of the procedural reforms in Labor Board practice would be thrown into the discard.

All of these provisions of existing law would be omitted by the bill reported by the Labor Committee, and you can read the majority report on the bill from beginning to end without finding a single word to justify what the bill does in this regard. It is the position of the Republican minority that the House should have an opportunity to consider all of these provisions, decide whether it is desirable to retain them as part of our law, and make only such changes in existing law as the facts justify.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to the editorial in today's Washington Post, dealing extensively with the important legislation we have before us today, which says, in part:

> We suspect that a large majority of the Members of the House know in their hearts that the enactment of this measure without extensive amendment would be a colossal blunder.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, this is, indeed, an auspicious occasion. As the Congress begins debate on the pending Labor Relations Act of 1949, the event should be marked as a red-letter day on the calendar of every American who loves freedom, cherishes justice, and who has a sincere regard for the constitutional guaranties of a free people.

Mr. Chairman, economic slavery is just as distasteful to a free people as physical servitude. I say to you, my colleagues, that our beloved America cannot long endure half free and half slave. This was so in the days of Lincoln. It is particularly true in our present highly industrial state.

There is no room in these United States for a second-class citizenship such as is set up under the Taft-Hartley Act. There must be reborn in these sacred halls the faith of our fathers—a faith and a determination that there is and shall continue to be in our Republic equal justice under law.

Big business as we know it, eager to exploit, demands that the welfare of our Nation makes necessary the continuation of our system of free enterprise. With this idea, labor is in full accord. In return labor asks only that it be permitted to organize, and that it be accorded full right to free collective bargaining in the sale of its services. To this big business, in its desire to amass huge profits, replied through the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 that labor must be restricted, both politically and economically.

What, may I ask, has happened to that era of good feeling and mutual confidence and respect that existed during the last war, when business was prone to say collective bargaining was necessary to the continuance of this same free-enterprise system. If teamwork was necessary to win the shooting war, why is it not equally necessary to win this cold war that now engulfs us.

They say history repeats itself. I agree fully. At the close of the First World War big business succeeded in breaking most labor unions and this one-sided policy led us to economic disaster in 1929, when our free-enterprise system was without counterchecks and balances, and rugged individualism ran roughshod over human rights to the detriment of our public welfare.

At the close of World War II we again see big business, aided and abetted by the Republican Party, engaged in another drive to make material things, not human welfare, the theme song of the postwar era. The first Republican-controlled Congress in 15 years—the Eightieth Congress—gave you the so-called Labor Relations Act of 1947—the Taft-Hartley Act—and in so doing they turned back the clock of labor-management relations a quarter of a century to the post-World War I era, when government by injunction was legal.

For what do these Republican gentlemen propose to punish labor? For winning the war, on the battle front and the industrial front? For establishing an all-time record of production? For making America the arsenal of democracy? During 4 years of global warfare, with all its hardships and heartbreaks on the home front, and while the husbands and sons of the workers were fighting, less than one-half of 1 percent of all available working time was lost by reason of strikes. Had industry kept its high-sounding no-war-profiteering pledge as well as labor kept its no-strike pledge, our national debt today would not be so high.

I see before me men, Members of this body, grown old and gray in the labor movement, who remember the infamous Hinchman Coal Co. and the Eagle Glass Co. cases that originated in the United States district court in West Virginia, in the period of the First World War. These cases set the pattern for a national policy that soon became a stench in the nostrils of liberty-loving Americans.

My native State of West Virginia emerged from the crucible of the Civil War with the motto Montani Semper Liberi, which means Mountaineers Always Free. Despite this love for liberty and freedom, our State during the 1920's saw constitutional government submerged to the will of the courts. So flagrant were the abuses by the mine guards and the Baldwin-Phelps detectives, operating under cover of mandatory injunctions, that rioting and violence broke out, which finally led to an armed march of thousands of workingmen in protest to these abuses and in protest to the contravening of their constitutional guaranties.

Men demanding only simple justice were charged with treason. Instead of a trial before a jury of their peers, they were held in contempt of a mandatory injunction of the United States court; and instead of a trial at the scene of the alleged crime, they were dragged hundreds of miles away to a distant part of our State and tried in the same courtroom in which they tried John Brown for treason in the Civil War days. Many of them went to prison following their conviction by a three-judge United States district court.

I say to you, my colleagues, that there is in the present Taft-Hartley labor law and the proposed Wood bill the foundation for a recurrence of this disgraceful episode. God forbid that my native State, or any other State within

this Union, shall once again be prostrated at the feet of those whose motto is the "almighty dollar."

Where, may I again ask, is that unity, that singleness of purpose that carried our Nation to victory in the world's most gigantic struggle. What about those promises made under patriotic compulsion, that we would never forget those who fought so gallantly on the field of battle and those who labored so diligently in our mines, in our mills, and in our factories, to make possible that great victory.

Two years after the cease-fire order ended the greatest of all wars we see those, who shed crocodile tears over the need for national unity in wartime, engaged in an all-out economic war to hamper and even destroy organized labor. Why, I ask, would a sane America want to weaken our first line of defense against Communist ideology? Why would we want to destroy that very segment of our population on which our Nation must depend in the event of a third world war, that now appears inevitable?

After years of struggle to be freed from the constant threat of the Federal injunction, labor appeared to have reached the promised land through the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932. This act was hailed by a labor spokesman "as a protective shield against invasion of rights that always belonged to labor." In 1947, however, the protective shield was badly cracked by the injunctive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Taft-Hartley Act, Mr. Chairman, has revived the use of the Federal injunction in labor disputes and has reinforced it by directives for its immediate use by public officers against unions. The Thomas-Lesinski bill contains no provision requiring or authorizing the use of the injunction. The Taft-Hartley Act, however, had made such inroads upon the Norris-LaGuardia Act that in drafting the Thomas-Lesinski bill it was considered necessary to restore the Norris-LaGuardia Act to its original status.

The proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act have attempted to justify its injunctive provisions on the grounds that injunctions can be sought only by the Government; that they are not made available to private employers. Well, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, that is not entirely true. Section 302 of the act, relating to welfare funds and the check-off, provides for the use of injunctions to restrain violations of the section and such injunctions are not restricted to the Government.

But what difference does it make, Mr. Chairman, that only the Government can seek these modern, streamlined Taft-Hartley injunctions? Should that fact make them more palatable to the labor organizations which are restrained from striking, picketing, and other activities for legitimate objectives? Does the fact that the Government secures these injunctions make them any less effective in hampering workers in their exercise of basic rights? Obviously not. Indeed, the fact that the Government seeks these Taft-Hartley Act injunctions has a decided advantage for employers, not the least of which is that the costs and inconveniences of litigation are borne by the Government.

The history of the use of injunctions, Mr. Chairman, shows that the intervention of the Government made the injunction an even more oppressive weapon. It was the Government that accelerated the use of injunctions in labor disputes by showing the way in the Debs case. Injunctions had been secured prior to the Debs case, but after that case the trickle of injunctions became a flood. I do not think I would be wrong in saying that it was Government use of the injunction, more than employer use, that led to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Then there is the injunction authorized in section 10 (j), which permits the Board to seek injunctive relief in the case of any unfair labor practice immediately upon the issuance of a complaint and prior to the adjudication of the case by the Board. While this type of Taft-Hartley injunction is available against both employers and unions, the score thus far is 6 to 2 in favor of the employers.

The use of this injunction, Mr. Chairman, is discretionary with the general counsel and he saw fit to announce that he considered it a very sacred trust to be used sparingly and only "where either a large segment of the public welfare is endangered or where life and property are seriously and in reality threatened, or where there is a principle involved that will result in substantial and widespread irreparable damage or injury of more than a merely private nature."

Now let us look at the pressing issues which warranted resort to the use of this sacred trust in some of the cases against unions. One case involved the retail meat departments of 11 A & P stores out of a total of the 5,000 stores in the national chain. In the ITU case it was alleged that "there would be paralysis in the newspaper industry" although newspapers printed by substitute methods have continued to reach readers in the Chicago area despite a strike that has been in progress for over a year.

In another case, the Conway Express case, there were involved the operators of an independent freight carrier doing a small volume of interstate work, and a companion case arose out of a temporary cessation of deliveries at the shipping dock of one store outlet of the large Montgomery Ward chain. Where was the danger to a large segment of the public welfare, the serious threat to life and property, the substantial and widespread irreparable damage or injury of more than a merely private nature in these cases? Let us not place any more sacred trusts in an administrative agency which can lead to such an indiscriminate use of such a powerful weapon as the injunction.

The third type of Taft-Hartley injunction, Mr. Chairman, is provided in section 10 (1). This section requires the Board to seek injunctive relief against unions in the case of secondary boycotts and related matters. The employer really gets service under this provision. Such a complaint is given priority over all other complaints and if, after investigation, the Board's agent has reasonable cause to believe that a complaint should be issued, he must—it is mandatory—petition a Federal court for an injunction.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, in such cases a different test of coverage of the act is applied than in any other case. In a recent case the Board declined jurisdiction over a plastering contractor who had been charged with an unfair labor practice on the ground that his activities were essentially local and had only a remote and unsubstantial effect on interstate commerce. The Chairman of the Board stated, however, that the Board would not have a similar discretion to decline jurisdiction if the same case had involved a secondary boycott by a union. The effect of this is well stated by another member of the Board who disagreed with the Chairman. He stated:

> If the employer commits an unfair labor practice, the employees are left without redress; whereas if the union violates section 8 (b) (4) (A) the employer is afforded plenary relief.

I am sure the Chairman of the Board reached his conclusion reluctantly. He had no choice, however, under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

These mandatory 10 (1) injunctions, Mr. Chairman, can be secured only in the case of union unfair labor practices. In answer to criticisms of the one-sided nature of this provision, our opponents have tried to justify this one-sidedness by arguing that this injunction is directed at union practices which threaten the very existence of a business. What are some of these horrible practices, Mr. Chairman? In one case it was the distribution of an "unfair list" and peaceful picketing by one picket. In another case union members refused to work alongside of nonunion workers installing floor coverings, the nonunion men being employees of the supplier of the floor coverings, a retailer of housing material. These are typical of the threats to the existence of businesses which the Board has been required to enjoin under the Taft-Hartley Act.

These injunctions, Mr. Chairman, are issued after a summary proceeding which is in no sense a determination of the merits of the case. The summary nature of injunction proceedings is particularly objectionable when you realize that the effect of an injunction in a labor dispute is not to maintain the status quo, but to upset it by stopping the picketing, boycott, or strike and returning the situation to where it was prior to the action in question. In other words, Mr. Chairman, although these injunctions are supposed to be temporary relief pending the adjudication of the case by the Board, they really effectively and finally determine the outcome of the dispute.

The effect of these injunctions, Mr. Chairman, is to deprive unions of these economic weapons, because their effectiveness depends upon their use at the strategic moment. The lapse of time

between the issuance of the injunction and the final adjudication by the Board of the merits of the case does the union irreparable damage. If the Board later finds that no unfair practice has been committed by the union, there is no possible way to undo the damage done to the union by the injunction. The passage of time is a very effective weapon of advantage to the employer.

Some supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act are willing to retreat to the extent that they will remove the mandatory-injunction provision and leave only the permissive injunction. The new Wood bill makes two major changes in the injunction provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Both are more objectionable to labor than the Taft-Hartley bill itself.

It removes the provision making it mandatory for the general counsel to secure an injunction against an unfair labor practice as defined in sections 8 (b) (4) (A), (B), and (C)—secondary boycotts—the bill would grant new and broad injunction power to the general counsel. In section 10 (j) of the Wood bill, it is provided "whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice under this act, the general counsel may petition any district court of the United States for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to such matter." This means that the general counsel may secure an injunction as soon as a charge is filed with a regional office and before any complaint has been issued in that case.

Section 10 (j) also permits the court to grant a temporary restraining order, an ex parte proceeding—to be effective for not more than 5 days—without any notice or hearing to the party against whom the injunction is issued. Here we have an example of a real labor czar with unlimited powers. I object, and I am sure other Members of the Congress object, to placing such legal authority in the hands of an executive officer.

I want no part of the injunctive provisions, permissive or mandatory. I am basically opposed to any legislative enactment that contravenes a citizen's constitutional guarantees to the right of free speech, free press, and the right to a trial by a jury of his peers.

Injunctions are inherently one-sided since they are much more effective against unions than employers. The effectiveness of the economic weapons of unions depends upon their use at the strategic moment and I do not want any general counsel tipping the scales in favor of employers by exercising his discretion to seek an injunction. The history of labor legislation, excluding of course the Taft-Hartley Act, is the history of efforts to free labor from the pressure of poorly informed and sometimes hostile courts.

The supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act have ridiculed the charge that there has been a revival of government by injunction and have pointed to what they describe as the limited use of Taft-Hartley injunctions. As of January 31, 1949, Mr. Chairman, 41 injunctions had been sought under sections 10 (j) and (l) of the Taft-Hartley Act, all but two of which have been directed against unions. Thirty-nine petitions for injunctions against unions in a period of 18 months. When you consider the far-reaching effect of the injunction upon the relationships of the parties to a dispute, you must agree that this is a high number in a period of generally favorable economic conditions. Compare this number to 83 cases brought under the Sherman Act during the period of 1890 to 1930—83 injunctions in 40 years against 39 injunctions in 18 months. The charge of government by injunction is well-founded.

The fourth Taft-Hartley injunction is that provided in section 208, which authorizes the President to direct the Attorney General to petition for injunctive relief against work stoppages of a national emergency character. Authorities in the field of labor relations have testified that an injunction in most cases serves to aggravate a dispute and to delay its settlement. Of course that criticism is directed to the effectiveness of injunctions. The most ardent supporters of the Taft-Hartley legislation must agree that in the period of slightly less than 2 years in which the law has been operating, it has never settled a single labor dispute through injunctive procedure. In all the instances where the injunction was resorted to, the strike was finally settled around a bargaining table. One instance was the bituminous coal strike of 1948 where the final settlement on a contract was reached 12 days after the expiration of the 80-day period provided for in the injunction procedures.

Once more the Wood bill goes a step further than the existing Taft-Hartley Act in that the procedure for dealing with national emergency strikes is so changed so that the President must get an injunction before he can use the procedure of appointing a board of inquiry to determine the facts in the case. In effect, this provision means that the President may not attempt to use the board-of-inquiry method for settling the dispute until he has secured an injunction to force the workers to continue at their jobs or to return to them.

Here you have a grave constitutional question in which you deny the worker the right to strike. This new move of the coalition against labor is aimed solely at weakening the President's position in settling strikes affecting the national welfare. It kills the 30-day cooling-off period provided in the Lesinski bill and if adopted, would kill the 80-day inhibition against strikes contained in the present Taft-Hartley Act.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that regardless of their effectiveness, the use of injunctions in these situations is fundamentally bad. They increase the resentment of workers who are compelled to work for private employers with no comparable burden put upon the employer and encourage employers to refuse to bargain, knowing that they will have the labor of their employees for at least 80 days on their own terms. In effect, Mr. Chairman, this injunctive provision presents to employers a gift of the forced labor of their employees for a period of 80 days. The injunctive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have been aptly described as hateful and unnecessary. The sole test of a labor-management law should be its effectiveness in promoting collective bargaining and peaceful industrial relations. The sanctions of the injunction, with its overtone of compulsion, will never create harmonious relationships between management and labor.

There is no justification for arbitrary legal prohibitions or compulsions in labor-mangement disputes, no matter how pressing the need for such steps might appear to be in the heat of the moment. The distinction between strikes that affect the public health and safety and strikes that do not is an extremely questionable one, and it is easy to confuse mere inconvenience with emergency. It is safe to say that we have never had a strike in this country that created a genuine national emergency involving a clear and present danger, as distinguished from temporary inconvenience. No such emergencies occurred during the years when the Norris-LaGuardia Act was in full force and they will not occur when that act is restored to full force. Workers and their leaders are no more unpatriotic and no more immune from the force of public opinion than any other groups in our society.

Only a police state can abolish strikes. No country which values free labor can abolish strikes in any industry, however affected with the public interest, so long as the employers are private persons or corporations. The ambiguous and yet undefinited terms "national emergency" and "public health and safety" have been used to cloak a multitude of sins—it should be recalled that Hitler used them to seize and secure his total power over the lives of the people of Germany. Surely a law which justifies and makes possible suppression of the basic freedoms by the Government on these vague grounds creates a greater inherent threat to the public welfare than the contingencies at which it is aimed. The enactment of a law that impairs the rights of one group today establishes a precedent for the impairment of those of other groups tomorrow.

It is revealing that those who have been the most insistent in their use of the catch-all phrase "public health and welfare" to justify the suppression of free collective bargaining in wide sectors of industry are the same ones who oppose most strenuously Government activities designed to further the public health and welfare in limited fields where a genuine need is most apparent and readily definable, such as housing, social security, and health insurance. Their pet peeve is summed up in the phrase "creeping socialism." They are really the mouthpiece for the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Where this injunction procedure has been used, it has definitely hindered the ironing out of grievances and that voluntary mutual agreement between the parties directly concerned that is the essence of collective bargaining and the only sound basis for lasting industrial peace and stability. Strikes are not the causes of industrial unrest but the effects of more basic underlying grievances. The arbitrary suppression of effective

protests against those grievances only serves to aggravate them further and build up pressures that would be bound to eventually culminate in an outburst that all the laws on the books could not control.

Speaking facetiously, Mr. Chairman, may I make the point that all that labor wants out of the Eighty-first Congress is its "two front teeth" which were kicked in by the Taft-Hartley law.

More seriously, Mr. Chairman, labor does not plead for charity. It demands equal justice under law. The right to free collective bargaining. The right to be a part of this great America of ours on an equal footing with all other segments of our society. To grant their plea the Congress must repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reject the vicious provisions of the proposed Wood bill as a substitute for the pending legislation.

I trust it will be the privilege and the pleasure of the House to grant labor's plea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has again expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, according to the schedule which the minority side has worked out under the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL], I am going to treat the subject of strikes in national emergencies.

It should be perfectly apparent that we must have industrial order and industrial law just as we have civil law. Without industrial law and procedure we will have anarchy, licensed and legalized, just as we might have lynching, without civil law.

Our trouble with regard to strikes and injunctions, which the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] dwelt upon, probably would have been settled under the common law, and gradually worked out in the absence of special legislation. When strikes, under the common law, became concerted action, conspiracy, and a fraud against the individual as well as the public, the courts dealt with such lawlessness. We got into difficulties. Conditions were rough in relations between management and labor. Strangely enough, most of the evils of strikes and injunctions that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] described were a quarter of a century ago. We had not worked out our civil rights in labor relations. I, for one, would be in favor of repealing the Taft-Hartley Act if at the same time we should repeal the Wagner Act, and go back to the free society, rough and tough as it might be. We should be able to work it out under the common law. But we quit that possibility with the Norris-LaGuardia Act. At that time we began to exempt labor unions entirely from the law. We made them anarchists on their own account. They could strike and picket and commit violence; after that there was no satisfactory legal procedure by which order could be restored.

Now we have a system of law that has been developing over the past 15 years, a system of procedures in the Labor Relations Board, in the general council, in conciliation, and in the courts. There is no excuse now for labor not to submit to law and regular proceedings like any other individual or group must submit to law. Certainly, labor cannot be the one exception to the law, the one group that is free to take the law into its own hands. It cannot be allowed to decide what is right by mere men compelling other men to do right or to cease from doing wrong through the compulsions of an individual or a group of individuals without regard to the law or the courts. Under that exemption from law, the Wagner Act was a specific invitation to one group alone in our society to do as it pleased. It was invited to settle its own affairs according to strikes, picketing, and compulsion.

In 1946 we experienced the evils of the railroad strike. That was so bad, prior to the Taft-Hartley hearings, that the President himself introduced a bill in this House to draft the railroad employees into the Army in order by that method to compel the settlement of the railroad strike. Then we got into the coal strike with no law covering the situation. At a nod or a wink, which the court described, 400,000 men quit instantly in an industry Nation-wide, by concert of action in the digging and transporting of coal in the wintertime. That had been a regular annual occurrence for years; something dreaded by the whole Nation. There was no adequate law or procedure to deal with the problem. Squads of rough, tough guys would ride roughshod through a town to warn the people to obey the arbitrary will of a single boss, affecting the property rights of owners, the right to work of individuals, and ignoring completely the public health and safety.

You all remember that. Then came a series of other acts of violence. Whole States were paralyzed by strikes. Half of the State of Pennsylvania was in the grip of a beer war carried on by widespread violence of the transport union.

The provision in the Taft-Hartley Act known as the National Emergency Provision, section 206, was enacted as a result. May I read it to you:

SEC. 206. Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations or engaged in the production of goods for commerce will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lock-out or the continuing thereof; and if the court finds such threatened or actual strike or lock-out.

First, affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, or if permitted to occur or to continue will imperil the national health or safety, the Attorney General shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike, or lock-out, or the continuing thereof for a period of 80 days.

This does not in any case refer to the right of the individual to quit work. Nobody can argue in reason that when 400,000 men in an entire industry covering a whole nation and the source of supply of the whole nation quit on the tick of a watch in concert that that is merely the exercise of the right to quit work in the ordinarily accepted term. That is instead a conspiracy against the public. It is a use of force, a taking into their own hands the exercise of rights over the property of others and over the rights of individuals to work or not to work, all of which is accompanied generally by violence or threats of violence. Those 400,000 men are not exercising the right to work or not to work as individuals. Their rights are subjected to the whim and will of another mere man who alone gives the nod restoring those individual rights and the rights of property and the health and safety of the public. He alone grants or denies industrial peace.

The Taft-Hartley law covered, therefore, a conspiracy, a lawless act and violence that protected rather than violated constitutional rights.

The best test to find out whether it works honestly and fairly and by orderly procedure is to review very briefly the national emergencies and threatened strikes since the Taft-Hartley Act.

We start with the injunction secured in the atomic-energy case. There the court found, and the affidavits so stated, that the experimentations going on at that time, which was March 5, 1948, in the most critical laboratory of all, having to do with one of the two known materials that have to do with the making of atomic energy and having to do with the carrying on of the national defense, was selected by a group of labor unions for a strike. On the basis of maintaining the continuity of that delicate operation and of our national security, the court granted an injunction. After the appointment of a fact-finding board and after conciliation services were brought to bear under the act, the strike was settled.

In the same month, on March 16, a meat-packers strike was threatened and another national emergency was created. The President immediately declared a national emergency affecting the health of the people and the Attorney General secured an injunction. In that case, and after orderly procedures, the meat-packers strike was settled. There was no disorder; there was no violence to speak of, there was no endangering of the public health, there was no violation of property rights.

And so we went into the second threatened coal strike, into the communications strike, into the maritime strike in June 1948, and finally again into the coal strike of June 1948.

I have copies of the documents here before me. They are perfect representations of what legal procedure does in order to bring about orderly settlements. The final order in the atomic-energy case illustrates fairly well what has happened under this provision of the land. Here is a part of the order of the court:

And, upon the oral hearing of the application of the United States of America for such temporary restraining order, counsel for all defendants—

That is, all of the unions; there were something like 20 of them—

having agreed and stipulated in open court that further hearings are unnecessary and are waived and that, in lieu of the entry of such temporary restraining order and a further hearing on plaintiff's application for a preliminary injunction and for further relief, a final injunction as contemplated by sections 208–210 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 may be entered against all defendants in this action on the basis of the showing made at the application for the temporary restraining order.

In other words, the whole business had been satisfactorily settled out of court. The 80-day cooling-off period had worked.

In the Thomas-Lesinski bill there is no such orderly legal procedure provided for at all. First, it provides that the President may make a proclamation in the case of a national emergency in which he asks the parties to desist just as he might make a proclamation for Thanksgiving, asking the parties to observe Thanksgiving or asking the Nation to observe National Flower Week, or some other national occasion, with no power whatsoever to carry out anything.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As an illustration, I think it was last year, the President appealed to the commercial bankers of the United States to soften down on the aggressiveness of making loans, to make loans more restrictive, in the hope of doing away with some of the inflationary forces. The bankers were not obligated except from the standpoint of protecting the public generally, and, had they not responded, they could have gone on. Now, as I understand the gentleman, under this condition the President would simply make a proclamation that there is an emergency and solicit the assistance of the two parties carrying on the strike which interfered with the national welfare.

Mr. GWINN. Exactly so; exactly as he might have returned to the 1946 period, when he might have proclaimed to all of the railroads in the country, "Gentlemen, there is an emergency; there is snow and ice on the ground; it is terrible to contemplate the shutting down of the railroad systems of the United States." And, yet, that is all he could say, and that is all he did say, and it did not work. So, he had to ask the Congress to draft the men into the armed service. In the coal strike it was the same thing.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. The gentleman referred to the provision of the Thomas-Lesinski bill as just giving the President the power to make a declaration. Is it not true that under that provision the President is given the power to appoint a board with power of investigation, power of research, and power of recommendation?

Mr. GWINN. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. For a period of 25 days.

Mr. GWINN. Now then, let me go on.

Mr. DOYLE. But the gentleman has not stated that yet.

Mr. GWINN. I have not gotten through stating the first one yet. I have here my notes, which I interrupted to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but he should state that fact.

Mr. GWINN. I understand that, and I intend to cover the whole thing.

The proclamation itself has no more power in it than what I have said. The President also has the power to appoint a board to study the situation for 25 days if he declares there is an emergency in national health and safety, but what is his remedy after the board reports? The third provision of the bill is to the effect that his remedy is to request or direct the men to go back to work, with no power to make them go back. If he had that power, that clearly would be unconstitutional. He would be attempting to tell men as individuals, after they have struck and are back home or are working someplace else, to go back to work. But he is without any legal authority to compel them to do so. And he should have no such power. That would be bad in every respect. It violates section 502 of the act. Let me read it to you. It protects the individual's right to work or not to work:

SEC. 502. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent; nor shall the quitting of labor by an employee or employees in good faith because of abnormally dangerous conditions for work at the place of employment of such employee or employees be deemed a strike under this act.

The Thomas-Lesinski bill presumes to give the President power to request or direct without any real authority to exercise compulsion to go back to work, which would be a definite violation of the individual's right. The original Taft-Hartley act and the Wood bill which is proposed make a very great and fundamental distinction in law. The whole process of conspiring as a group to strike in the first place is the illegal act, and the union officials, such as Mr. Lewis, are directed by the injunction not to make the nod in the first place which commits 400,000 men on a national scale to strike. It stops men from conspiring in the first place as an illegal act. It fines the leaders who commit the illegal act. The injunctive process stops the illegal acts instead of trying to compel the individual men go back to work once they are out.

Our plea is that we submit ourselves to legal procedures. That we govern ourselves according to laws. That we put strikes and closed shops and all such exercises of individual compulsory power of men over other men without legal process as wholly illegal and violent and contrary to the concept of a free society under law.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the gentleman from New York who just preceded me does not believe in the principle of free collective bargaining. At any rate he has done his dead level best to keep the Taft-Hartley law on the books ever since hearings started before the Committee on Education and Labor. He has referred many times during the debate to the necessity of the injunction and has referred to coal strikes. Since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law we have only had two work stoppages in the coal industry. The first was in 1947, when there was a memorial period commemorating the Centralia mine disaster which killed 111 coal workers in Illinois. There were no walk-outs in protest against the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

On June 30 the mines were returned to the private operators and a brief stay away followed until the new contract was completed giving the miners additional benefits together with 10 cents a ton for welfare funds, which was justifiable inasmuch as no new contract was completed.

In 1948 the dispute was over the disbursement of welfare and retirement funds which was later settled in a manner which was detailed here this afternoon. No one will argue that their leader should be condemned for holding out for a well-financed welfare-fund royalty.

Concerning these gentlemen who have undertaken to defend the Taft-Hartley law and the amended Wood bill, I think we should look in the background and see who is the author of the Taft-Hartley law, and see whether or not it undertakes to protect free collective bargaining. In my judgment it puts the Government on the side of management. In other words, instead of letting the unions and management bargain at the bargaining table, as the Wagner Act did, and which was the basis of the Wagner Act, the Taft-Hartley Act enables management to take a seat at the bargaining table and destroys the principle of free collective bargaining. We have heard much talk about the authorship of the Taft-Hartley law. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, if he had yielded to me earlier this afternoon, if he would be willing to accept the name of the amended Wood bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I am sorry; I do not understand the gentleman. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. PERKINS. I mean, would you be willing that the amended Wood bill carry the name of McConnell?

Mr. McCONNELL. That is agreeable to me. I have nothing against the Wood bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, when these hearings were being conducted a lawyer by the name of Gerald D. Morgan appeared before the House Committee on Education and Labor. He revealed the backstage draftsmanship of the House bill. He stated that he had first obtained permission from ex-Representative Hartley and Congressman HALLECK, of Indiana, before appearing before the committee. He stated that several months after the Taft-Hartley law was enacted he received compensation from the Republican National Committee. In the course of that hearing I

asked Mr. Morgan this question. You will find that question on page 1160 and following of the hearings which were held before the Committee on Education and Labor:

I want to make the observation that I have been wondering, ever since we started these hearings, up until I heard this witness, just who prepared the act. I am glad to have this information along with the other counsel who assisted you in the preparation of the act.

I notice from your statement that you applied approximately 24 hours a day in drafting the act for a period of several months, and that you received no compensation until several months after the bill became law. You further stated that when you were paid compensation you were paid by the Republican National Committee and that you had no contract with Representative HALLECK or Mr. Hartley concerning what your compensation would be.

Inasmuch as you applied yourself so diligently and you have disclosed the fact to the committee, would you mind telling the committee just how much compensation you received from the Republican National Committee for this difficult task that you have detailed to the committee?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir, I would not. I received $7,500.

Mr. PERKINS. That is, from the Republican National Committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

The successful efforts of the Republican National Committee in getting the Taft-Hartley law enacted was the first step to take away the gains and benefits which the laboring people received during the 13 years under President Roosevelt. The so-called amended Wood bill is the second attempt of the Republican leadership to hold fast to all gains under Taft-Hartley by forming a coalition group and sponsoring a bill to be offered as an amendment which is even more drastic on the principle of free collective bargaining than Taft-Hartley.

In committee, the original Wood bill was offered as a substitute for the Lesinski repealer, by the ranking Republican member of the Education and Labor Committee, and the Democratic members voted down their substitute.

In comparing the amended Wood bill with the Taft-Hartley Act, you will readily detect that the name of Taft-Hartley is eliminated. Notwithstanding the fact that the bill repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and reenacts the Wagner Act; the latter, however, is amended by provisions taken either verbatim or in substance from the Taft-Hartley Act except in a few instances. Although we have a change of name, we still have the Taft-Hartley law incorporated in this so-called Wood bill.

The Democratic Party will not stand idly by and permit the Republican leadership to swap names and at the same time pass another labor law which in some respects is more drastic and oppressive on labor unions than Taft-Hartley.

Now, looking a little further into the background of the Taft-Hartley law, let us see just who did prepare this bill.

Mr. Morgan stated that he was the only person other than the Representatives who sat in on all of the executive sessions during the drafting of the entire Taft-Hartley law. He stated that he received technical assistance from one Gerald Reilly. The evidence before our committee showed that Gerald Reilly at the time of the hearings was receiving $3,000 a month as a lobbyist from General Electric, not considering his many other corporate clients. Mr. Morgan also stated that he received technical assistance from Theodore Iserman, chief counsel for the Chrysler Corp.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] in those hearings made the comment, and I quote his comment. This is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], the ranking minority Republican member of the committee.

He said:

If you had said $25,000 I would not have been surprised, knowing the charges for that kind of work throughout the country.

Here is what Mr. Morgan said about the original draft of the House Taft-Hartley bill:

I have taken the Smith committee amendments to the Wagner Act that had passed the House in 1940, and the vetoed Case bill that had passed both Houses in 1946, combined the two into one document for working purposes, and had incorporated therein a number of additional ideas.

He used those for his preliminary discussions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The average American would be shocked to know that the so-called Taft-Hartley bill was written by the most vicious big-business lobbyist and paid for by the National Republican Committee rather than being written as a fair law to provide equality of bargaining power between management and labor.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the record ought to be straight. What was Gerald Reilly's position at the time of the drafting of this legislation? Is it not true—I am not sure about it, I do not believe I know Mr. Reilly; I do not think I would know him if I saw him, but my understanding is that he was special counsel to the Senate committee at that time; and certainly I believe the gentleman wants to be fair about this.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes; that is right. He was special counsel for Senator Ball, so I am informed.

Mr. HALLECK. It was my understanding that he was special counsel for someone in connection with the drafting of the legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not believe that he was employed by the House Committee on Education and Labor. I think that was brought out. As I understand, he was chief counsel for Senator Ball.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. JACOBS. I believe it was well understood by our committee that he was special counsel for someone; we did not know whom.

Mr. PERKINS. I accept the correction from the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Good names are hard to make and preserve; slurs are very cheap and easy to make. The gentleman has been making some statements here concerning Mr. Gerald Morgan.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to the gentleman that Mr. Morgan was for a long time counsel for and served the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives; he was a member of the drafting staff of the House of Representatives. He was regarded by every man who knew him as one of the finest young men who has ever served with us in such capacity. I believe that statement will be concurred in by everyone.

Whatever the gentleman has to say concerning whom he represents is all right with me, but I may say to the gentleman that Jerry Morgan never told you a lie; Jerry Morgan never tried to mislead you; Jerry Morgan never refused any answer that related to anything he did. I just thought that ought to go in the RECORD. He is no employee of mine; I do not even know what State he is from; I do not know what his politics are, and I do not care; but in my opinion Jerry Morgan is a young man of fine ability trying to make a living, and I am not going to sit idly by and let him be slurred.

Mr. PERKINS. In response to the gentleman from North Carolina I wish to state that in my judgment Mr. Morgan is a very astute lawyer, and I do believe that he told the whole truth before the committee when he appeared as a witness. As to whom he was employed by at the time he drafted the act I am not certain; and I want to make the correction in that regard because I was informed that he was counsel for Senator Ball, although that may be incorrect.

Mr. BARDEN. Who is that?

Mr. PERKINS. Gerald Reilly.

Mr. BARDEN. In other words, the gentleman knows nothing improper about or nothing that was detrimental to the good name of Jerry Morgan.

Mr. PERKINS. No; I do not know anything.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman has referred to who wrote the Taft-Hartley Act or law. Can the gentleman tell us and tell the Members of this House who wrote the Lesinski bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. Our Members helped us draft that bill. That is in the record in the Senate.

Mr. PERKINS. In my judgment, the Thomas-Lesinski bill was prepared by

Members of Congress for the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2032 is a bill which restores the national policy of free collective bargaining and adds some provisions designed to make the policy even more effective. I want to take a few minutes to explain why, in that bill, we did not include two provisions that are in the Taft-Hartley Act—the provisions requiring the filing of a non-Communist affidavit by representatives of unions, and the use of the injunction in so-called unfair-practice cases of employees as well as in labor disputes.

The elimination of Communists would seem to be the purpose of this provision of the Taft-Hartley Act, but it does not accomplish that. The act affects only a limited number of officers. If these do not sign non-Communist affidavits, then none of the members of the union nor the union itself can avail themselves of the services of the NLRB.

But, at the same time, the union cannot protect itself under the Taft-Hartley Act against disrupters and Communists so long as they pay their dues. They now have rights which the Taft-Hartley Act seeks to protect. It is an unfair labor practice to require the employer to dismiss these disrupters and Communists. If they pay their dues, they can continue to propagandize among loyal workers; they can continue to bore from within; they can continue to agitate for quickies and for political strikes; they can continue to make the life of the union precarious in every way.

Is that the way to weaken the influence of communism in unions?

Communism is a major issue of our time. Let us deal with it as a whole, not in this underhanded way, which strengthens the influence of Communists in unions, on the one hand, while, on the other, it tries to create the impression that Communists are to be found only in unions.

As President Green, of the American Federation of Labor, pointed out at our hearing, we need to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act as an object lesson that unions are free in the United States and that they are encouraged by law to attain equality of bargaining power with employers and corporations.

Of all the provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act, the return to government by injunction is the most objectionable. Injunctions prejudge cases when they are issued at the request of the Government, just as they do when issued at the request of the employer. For practical purposes, the issue of an injunction in an unfair-practice case is an immediate victory for the employer. It settles the issue in the employer's favor and the union rarely finds it advantageous to continue the case in the hope of overcoming the prejudice thus created.

The provision in the Taft-Hartley Act regarding the handling of strikes or threatened stoppages which would jeopardize the national health and safety is the wrong way to approach this problem. The Director of Conciliation testified before the Senate committee that they sometimes had to stop negotiations at a critical period before the dead line provided in the act was reached in order that a board of inquiry might be set up, since a report had to be filed before the President could ask for an injunction. The result was that weeks before the dead line firm positions were taken and negotiations effectively cut off. Then the Board made its report without recommendations, injunctions were sometimes issued, and the question became, not one of settling the controversy but rather of living up to the terms of the injunction. According to the former labor-relations director for New York City who appeared before our committee, the emergency strike provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act hindered the settlement of the tugboat and longshore disputes in New York.

The Lesinski bill recognizes that there may be national emergencies because of an actual or threatened work stoppage and that the public interest must be protected, but it avoids the use of the injunction process of unhappy experience.

When the President declares that a national emergency exists, he may appoint an emergency board to investigate and make findings and recommendations, which are not permitted under the Taft-Hartley Act, thus missing the opportunity to focus the interest of the parties and the public on a reasonable solution. The status quo will be maintained without the threat of an injunction, as it has been under the Railway Labor Act. This is generally acceptable to both labor and management.

There is no record that the use of the injunction as provided in the Taft-Hartley Act has either solved industrial-relations problems or provided a guaranty against work stoppages. In a number of cases a strike ensued after the entire waiting period was consumed. The effect of the injunction was to delay the strike and then to delay the settlement while discussing the issues raised by the injunction.

The provision in the Lesinski bill shortens the waiting period to 25 days, but it requires that the status quo be maintained during this period and that the board of inquiry make actual recommendations. According to the most experienced men in conciliation and mediation, this is an improvement over the provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act and makes completely unnecessary the resort to the injunction process.

In my judgment—and I do not think that this committee can get away from it, when you consider how this Taft-Hartley Act was drawn up and how big business operated in drafting the Taft-Hartley Act—that we cannot permit the Taft-Hartley Act to stand on the books, and neither will we permit a change to the Wood bill, which is nothing more or less than Taft-Hartley No. 2 that carries some added features, which makes the injunctive power more destructive to labor.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have never been very much given in my service in the House of Representatives to getting up over a tempest in a teapot. But since the matter has been brought up here, I am very happy that the gentleman from Kentucky, who has just spoken, has done what he has to lay the ghost of the charge that the NAM or the Chamber of Commerce or some other business organization wrote the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. He has helped to establish that the act was written by Members of Congress in the exercise of their legislative responsibility.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I just wish to state that it would be my best guess that the NAM furnished the money.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, the gentleman can engage in guesses all he wants to, but there come times when people ought to speak with authority and with integrity. The gentleman should know that his guess is wrong.

The gentleman spoke of Jerry Reilly being employed by General Electric. I do not know whether he is or not. But, I have just had inquiry made, and I understand that——

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me first answer the gentleman. I have had inquiry made and I am informed, not knowing him, and I do not now know what his employment is, but at the time this legislation was being written Jerry Reilly was on the professional staff of the Senate committee. So the gentleman from Kentucky made the wrong guess there.

As far as Jerry Morgan is concerned—and my interest in this is probably as much because of the insinuation about his character or capacity as anything else—I first became acquainted with Jerry Morgan when I met him as an active member of the Legislative Drafting Service of the House of Representatives. I was actively associated with him in his official capacity many times. Since 1935 he had much experience in drafting labor legislation. When it became necessary to arrange for the services of a technician to do the work of drafting legislation to express the policy determined by Members of Congress, I could think of no better person to do the job than Jerry Morgan. He worked on the legislation for almost 6 months for the Members of Congress and no one else, and I saw to it that he was honorably paid for his services.

In my contacts with him I always found him to be completely objective, completely fair, and recognized as undoubtedly the best and ablest authority on matters of labor-management legislation in the whole country.

May I say to my friend from North Carolina that he happens to be a registered Maryland Democrat, first employed by a Democratic Congress. I agree with

the gentleman from North Carolina that he has the confidence and the respect of every man who has served in the Congress who knows him, and I challenge anyone to say anything different.

The manner of his payment was all down on the records in the reports of the committee. I might have put him on my staff to fill the job of administrative assistant, but I never filled that position all the time I was majority leader, for 2 years. I saved the Government a little money by practicing a little economy. However, there were reasons why, from his standpoint as a practicing attorney, with absolutely no connection to prejudice or embarrass him at all, that was not desirable.

So I make no apology for the conduct of the matter. The truth of the matter is that I am glad that this tempest in a teapot has been raised, because it definitely establishes for everyone to know and understand that this Labor-Management Relations Act was written by the Members of Congress who were charged with that responsibility, obtaining the technical assistance and service of an acknowledged authority in helping them, not to write his opinions into the legislation, but simply to do the technical work. That, I may say to the gentleman, as he stays here through the years, if he does, he will find to be highly valuable in writing the legislation the Congress has to pass on.

When we Republicans came in to control of the Eightieth Congress we could not and did not send down to the departments to have a flock of Government lawyers run up here to go to work. The chairman of the committee has said very frankly that the administration helped to draft the present measure. I assume that is right. I trust they conferred with some of the members of the committee up here. I do not believe they conferred with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], who is the ranking Republican member or any other member on our side.

Certainly the manner in which the legislation was written in the last Congress—the Eightieth Congress—ought to commend itself to every fair-minded person in the country. It was a job tackled and done by Members of Congress in the discharge of their responsibility. The bill was then taken before the committee and read for amendment line by line over a period of several days, with 29 amendments adopted. Then the bill went through the process of consideration and amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I say that is something which contrasts with the situation that exists here today, when we have before us a bill drafted by goodness only knows who, after consultations with no one knows who, brought up here and rubber stamped by the committee, written before hearings were held, not after hearings were held, sought to be brought to the floor by the chairman of the committee under a gag rule that would foreclose any amendment, seeking to force the House of Representatives, a great representative, deliberative body, to rubber stamp it without even having a chance to amend it. If that is representative government in action, I cannot see it.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I think some Members are probably mistaken. Nothing has been said which would cast any reflection upon the character or reputation of Jerry Morgan. The point is that the Republican National Committee paid him. The gentleman from Indiana says that they did not have control of the executive branch of the Government and therefore they could not call experts from that branch to write the legislation. What was the matter with the committee of the House at that time, the Committee on Education and Labor, paying? That is the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago an enlightened Federal program for dealing with labor-management relations was brought to an abrupt end by the Eightieth Congress. In the words of one who should know, and I now quote from page 3 of a book entitled "Our National Labor Policy," by Mr. Fred A. Hartley, Jr., a former Member of this body:

> The enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act marked the beginning of a new national labor policy.

The basic purposes of our national labor policy, prior to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, were to encourage collective bargaining and to protect the rights of workers to organize and designate representatives of their own choosing for the purpose of collective bargaining. Accordingly, the Wagner Act was a simple piece of legislation which legally guaranteed to workers the free exercise of an inherent human right by requiring of employers only that they refrain from using certain unfair practices which interfered with the right of workers to organize and that they, the employers, bargain with the freely chosen representatives of their employees. The Wagner Act provided the minimum of Government interference with the voluntary procedures of free collective bargaining upon which our national labor policy was and should be based. The Wagner Act stated briefly its requirements; established the Board to administer them; provided for judicial enforcement and review; and established a minimum of procedures for the guidance of the Board, properly leaving the further development of administrative procedures to the Board's discretion. To repeat, Mr. Chairman, it was a simple act which could not be less meddlesome.

The Eightieth Congress in a period of emotional stress transformed this uncomplicated act into an intricate piece of legislation into which was placed every provision inspired by the "there ought to be a law" complex which so many persons seem to have—provisions dealing with matters of public policy outside the proper scope of labor-management legislation, provisions collateral to and not directly connected with the subject of labor-management relations.

In the limited time allotted, I want to speak briefly about this one basic issue of national policy in this debate and about three among the many errors contained in the Taft-Hartley Act which contributed to the break-down of the act itself which has now come about.

The basic question is the matter of a national labor policy.

The errors are the writing into the Taft-Hartley Act of one, the requirement that the Department of Labor and the National Labor Relations Board shall be furnished with facts about the internal organization of unions and financial statements; two, the requirement that before unions can apply for the advertised protection of the act the union officials shall execute affidavits swearing that they are not members of the Communist Party; and three, the so-called mutual obligation to bargain laid upon employers and upon unions.

These three errors are typical of many embedded in the Taft-Hartley Act. It was this assortment of fishhooks and legal booby traps planted throughout the act that justified the comment, made immediately upon the passage of the law in 1947, that the Taft-Hartley Act was hell for workers, purgatory for employers, and heaven for the lawyers. Experience since that date has shown that statement to have been fact.

Today, as the inevitable result of the attempt to put labor relations in this country in a legal strait-jacket, to say "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" at every hour in the daily relationships between workers and management, with stipulated procedures, with the continual overhanging threat of arbitrary use of the injunctive power by the NLRB general counsel at the request of the employer, with both the NLRB and the Labor Department bogged down in paper work required under these and other evil provisions, the administration of the act is a complete and utter failure. It has broken down. By delaying justice for 1 and 2 years, it is denying the justice to workers it was advertised as protecting.

The regional office of the NLRB in the city of Detroit is telling the unions who appeal to it for action on complaints against employers that no action whatever can be expected for at least 4 months.

This means that effective action cannot be expected by workers and their unions in less than a year or 2 years, if the employer takes the matter through the courts.

Meantime, as has been said, employers can get service while they wait in the form of injunctions against unions. They get this short-order service from the ever eager and obedient NLRB General Counsel Denham, who has become expert at serving requests for injunctions off the cuff and sliding them down the counter on demand.

Before discussing this matter of national labor policy and the three evils in the act I should like, Mr. Chairman, to state that I know at first hand out of my own experience the harm that bad labor-management relations can do to all con-

cerned—workers, employers, and the entire community. I know, likewise, the beneficial effects of good labor-management relations. In the industrial city of Toledo it has been my privilege to serve the United Automobile Workers of America, CIO, the Toledo CIO Industrial Union Council, the Toledo municipal government, and the State of Ohio in a variety of official capacities. Both as an official of organized labor and as a public official, I have had opportunities to see the internal workings of the collective bargaining process. Let me assure my colleagues that the problems of labor-managment relations are not nearly as grim, as complex, as difficult of solution as I have heard them described here in this Capital City of our country.

It has been our experience in Toledo, where labor-management relations have been unusually cordial in recent years, that good relations between unions and management depend on good faith. The Toledo plan, which has been studied and praised by scores of industrial-relations experts, was an experiment in good faith. And it worked. It has worked—and it is still working—for the benefit of workers, of management, of the entire community.

The element of good faith has been present in labor-management relations in the city of Toledo for many years. At one time we had perhaps more than our share of discord in my home city. We had strikes—long, bitter strikes in which workers sought only recognition of their union and higher pay for their toil. We had police violence, and the National Guard—and plenty of bloodshed, I regret to say.

But eventually the employers of Toledo came around to the viewpoint that labor organizations were composed of decent, law-abiding citizens who wanted only their share of the American standard of living. Eventually, most employers came around to accept the view that unions are responsible organizations, democratic, and thoroughly in the American tradition. With that acceptance of unions, with that grant to the unions of equitable status at the collective-bargaining table—and in the entire community life—we climbed aboard the industrial peace train in my city of Toledo.

Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley Act was intended to destroy in dozens of ways—and does destroy—equality of status as between employers and unions. It thereby destroys the basis for sound, equitable, and peaceful relations between labor and management. Already it has wrecked good relations in many plants. If permitted to stand, I fear it would damage, and I feel sure in time would destroy, the good work accomplished under the Toledo plan and all other local and broader arrangements for sound labor-management relations.

A one-sided law, a law loaded against labor as the Taft-Hartley Act is loaded against labor, does not promote collective bargaining, fair dealing, and peaceful relations. It does not promote industrial peace because it denies industrial justice.

Because it provides a legal labyrinth for snaring workers and their unions into endless negotiations, litigations, injunctions, damage suits, and the like, the Taft-Hartley Act is productive only of mutual suspicion, fear, dislike, disgust, industrial conflict, leading to industrial war—a war that would be not of the workers' making, but a conflict forced upon them by individuals, groups, and forces determined, as in the 1920's, to weaken, divide, and destroy unions and the very idea and practice of unionism and collective bargaining in this country.

Turning now to what has been, what is now, and what should be our national labor policy, the single historical fact that stands like a mountain on the great plain of half a century of experience in industrial relations is this: more than wages, more than hours, more than working conditions, more than security of employment, American workers throughout our industrial history have wanted, have organized to get, have petitioned for, have demanded, have gone on strike for, and have sacrificed even their lives to win the right freely to organize into unions and to bargain collectively through unions of their own choosing with employers regarding all these conditions of employment. I insert at this point in my remarks excerpts from findings of commissions and committees that have investigated the Nation's major labor disputes since 1894, the year of the great Pullman strike:

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY OFFICIAL BODIES SHOWING THAT THE PRINCIPAL CAUSE OF INDUSTRIAL UNREST HAS BEEN ATTEMPTS TO DENY TO WORKERS THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE AND TO BARGAIN COLLECTIVELY

1894: United States Strike Commission, appointed by President Cleveland, examined 111 witnesses and found, as a cause of the strike, that "the Pullman Co. is hostile to the idea of conferring with organized labor in the settlement of differences arising between it and its employees."

"The company (the Pullman Co.) does not recognize that labor organizations have any place or necessity in Pullman, when the company fixes wages and rents, and refuses to treat with labor organizations. The laborer can work or quit in the terms offered, that is the limit of his rights. This position secures all the advantages of the concentration of capital, ability, power, and control for the company in its labor relations and deprives the employees of any such advantage or protection as a labor union might afford. In this respect the Pullman Co. is behind the age" (p. XXVI).

1898: The Industrial Commission, consisting of 5 Members of the Senate, 5 Members of the House, and 9 management and labor representatives appointed by the President, employed 27 experts, examined 700 witnesses and in its report declared:

"It is quite generally recognized that the growth of great aggregations of capital under the control of single groups of men, which is so prominent a feature of the economic development of recent years, necessitates a corresponding aggregation of workingmen with unions, which may be able also to act as units. It is readily perceived that the position of a single workman face to face with one of our great modern combinations, such as the United States Steel Corp., is in a position of very great weakness. A workman has one thing to sell—his labor. He has perhaps devoted years to the acquirement of a skill which gives his labor power a relatively high value, so long as he is able to put it in use in combination with certain materials and machinery. A single legal person has, to a very great extent, the control of such machinery and in particular of such materials. Under such conditions there is little competition for the workman's labor. Control of the means of production gives power to dictate to the working men upon what terms he shall make use of them" (p. 800).

"The tendency toward unified control of capital and business has only intensified without changing the disadvantages of the wage worker in his dealings with employers. Even when the number of employers is considerable, the number of workmen is far greater. The competition for work is normally far sharper than the competition for workmen."

"The seller of labor is worse off in several respects than the seller of almost any physical product. His commodity is in the highest degree perishable. That which is not sold today disappears absolutely. Moreover, in the majority of cases, the workman is dependent upon the sale of his labor for his support. If he refuses an offer, the next comer will probably accept it, and he is likely to be left destitute. * * *

"Considered merely as a bargainer, as an actual participant in the operations of the market, the workingman is almost always under grave disadvantages as compared with the employer. Except the trifling haggling which he may do in the purchase of his small necessities, he is accustomed to bargain only in the sale of his labor and the bargains which determine the sales are likely to be made at somewhat long intervals. Every employer, small or great, of necessity devotes a considerable share of his attention to bargains of purchase and of sale. If the labor bargain is made with a foreman, the foreman is continually engaged in such bargaining and develops in it a very special skill. * * *

"But aside from all questions of mental dexterity and acquired skill, the workingman is at a disadvantage in that his economic weakness is well known to his employer. The art of bargaining consists in a great degree in concealing one's own best terms and learning one's opponents. The workman cannot conceal his need of work, and cannot know how much his employer needs him. He is relatively ignorant of the conditions of the market, both the market for labor and the goods which his employer produces. It is the business of the employer to keep himself informed of the state of both markets. The employer is able to judge what he can afford to pay for a given quantity and kind of labor rather than do without it. Under such conditions the results of free competition is to throw the advantages of the bargain into the hands of the stronger bargainer" (pp. 801–802).

ECONOMIC RESULTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"An overwhelming preponderance of testimony before the industrial commission indicates that the organization of labor has resulted in a marked improvement of the economic condition of the workers. * * * (p. 802).

"The power of labor organizations to maintain wage rates, even in industrial depression, is repeatedly referred to in the testimony before the commission, and it is regarded by several witnesses as an influence of great importance in moderating the severity of depression and diminishing its length. By keeping up wages the organizations are asserted to increase the purchasing power of the wage workers, and so to diminish the tendency to overproduction and underconsumption" (p. 804).

DEMOCRACY IN INDUSTRY

"As the units of industry have become large, the individual workman has been further and further removed from the control of his own daily life. He has found himself under the control of powers upon whose conduct he has been able to exercise no direct influence" (p. 804).

"By the organization of labor and by no other means, it is possible to introduce an element of democracy into the government of industry. By this means only, the workers can effectively take part in determining the conditions under which they work. This becomes true in the fullest and best sense only when employers frankly meet the representatives of the workmen and deal with them as parties equally interested in the conduct of affairs. It is only under such conditions that a real partnership of labor and capital exists. * * *

"* * * If the working people are prevented from introducing an element of democracy into industrial life by way of labor organizations, they will undertake to introduce it in another way" (p. 805).

1902: United States Anthracite Coal Strike Commission, appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt, examined 558 witnesses, made a comprehensive study of the circumstances surrounding the 1902 coal strike, and its causes and concluded:

"The occasion of the strike of 1902 was the demand of the United Mine Workers of America for an increase in wages, a decrease in time * * * the cause lies deeper than the occassion and is to be found in the desire for recognition by the operators of the miners' union" (p. 31).

"The Commission is led to the conviction that the question of the recognition of the union and of dealing with the mine workers through their union, was considered by both operators and miners to be one of the most important involved in the controversy which culminated in the strike."

1913: United States Commission on Industrial Relations report upon the Colorado coal strike of 1913 stated that this strike involved:

"* * * as its major issue the demand of the miners for a voice in determining the conditions under which they worked. * * *

"In judging the merits of the miners' demand for collective bargaining, for that share in the management of the industry itself which is called industrial democracy, the Colorado strike must be considered as one manifestation of a world-wide movement of wage earners toward an extension of the principle of democracy in the workshop, the factory, and the mine * * *" (p. 6).

"By industrial liberty is here meant an organization of industry that will insure to the individual wage earner protection against arbitrary power in the hands of the employer" (p. 8).

This report stated that the operators refused to meet with the representatives of the miners.

"* * * in the light of Mr. Bowers' (a representative of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co.) admission that a mere conference would have prevented the strike, the operators' refusal to grant such a conference must be regarded as making them responsible for all the disasters that followed" (p. 86).

In describing in detail the violence in the strike, particularly the "Ludlow massacre, in which 5 men and 11 boys were killed by bullet wounds, and 11 children and 2 women by suffocation as a result of the deliberate firing of the tent colony by the State militia, Federal troops were subsequently sent in by President, and peace was restored."

Responsibility for "a condition of absolute prostration of government and of actual revolution" was placed upon the employers, and particularly upon John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for the length of the strike, 7 months, as well as the violence that took place.

Discussing the company union set up and sponsored by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., the report concluded that it embodied "none of the principles of effectual collective bargaining, and instead is a hypocritical pretense of granting what is in reality withheld."

1916: From the final report of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations, at public hearings throughout the country over a period of 154 days, listening to 740 witnesses, stated:

"It has been pointed out with great force and logic that the struggle of labor for organization is not merely an attempt to secure an increased measure of the material comforts of life, but is a part of the age-long struggle for liberty; that this struggle is sharpened by the pinch of hunger and the exhaustion of body and mind by long hours of improper working conditions; but that even if men were well fed they would still struggle to be free."

The report quoted the testimony of Louis D. Brandeis, later Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court:

"* * * And the main objection, as I see it, to the large corporation is that it makes possible—and in many cases makes inevitable—the exercise of industrial absolutism. It is not merely the case of the individual worker against employer, which, even if he is a reasonably sized employer, presents a serious situation calling for the interposition of a union to protect the individual. But we have the situation of an employer so potent, so well organized, with such concentrated forces and with such extraordinary powers of reserve and the ability to endure against strikes and other efforts of a union, that the relatively closely organized masses of even strong unions are unable to cope with the situation."

And the report continued:

"Both in theory and in practice, in the absence of legislative regulation, the working conditions are fixed by the employer.

"It is evident, therefore, that there can be at best only a benevolent despotism where collective action on the part of the employees does not exist."

1919: The report of the industrial conference called by President Woodrow Wilson to consider the causes of industrial unrest and to devise methods of solution, recommended:

"* * * Employees need an established channel of expression and an opportunity for responsible consultation on matters which affect them in their relations with their employers and their work * * *" (p. 9).

"* * * Representatives must be selected by the employees with absolute freedom. In order to prevent suspicion on any side, selection should be by secret ballot. There must be equal freedom of expression thereafter. All employees must feel absolutely convinced that the management will not discriminate against them in any way because of any activities in connection with shop committees."

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to turn to pages 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the majority report recommending enactment of this bill. Therein is set forth a condensed history of our national labor policy previous to the Wagner Act, under the Wagner Act, and under the Taft-Hartley Act, which is now about to be repealed.

I will not cover that history in detail, other than to point out that, when the Congress enacted the original Wagner Act in 1935, it had reviewed and accepted half a century of experience in industrial warfare caused by the persistent refusal of employers to accept union organization and collective bargaining. It had found that when the National War Labor Board in World War I for the first time applied on a limited scale the principle of collective bargaining, the number of organized workers had doubled, from 2,500,000 in 1915 to more than 5,000,000 in 1920.

In the next 10 years, the Nation had retreated to normalcy, to the phony prosperity of the frenzied twenties. Union membership dropped to less than 3,000,000 organized workers in 1933. Once strong unions, such as the United Mine Workers, were empty shells, having only a few thousand members and nearly empty treasuries. Good union men were compelled by the hunger of their families to conceal their union membership and to work at starvation wages in nonunion mines, mills, and factories.

Some may say there was comparative industrial peace in the twenties. It is true work stoppages dropped from 3,400 in 1920 to 637 in 1930. But this peace was not a peace brought about by industrial justice but by industrial terror and servitude on the employers' terms, policed by labor spies and enforced by court decrees.

Wages dropped to pre-World War I levels while prices stayed high. A depression resulted because the wage earners of America could not buy back a fair share of the products which they produced.

Farmers burned grain for fuel while miners starved because coal could not be sold to busted farmers.

The one exception was in the railroad industry. There, collective bargaining was established.

In 1933, one of the first steps to fight depression was enactment of Section 7–A of the National Industrial Recovery Act, which established the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

With the invalidation of the NRA, the Wagner Act became a necessity and was enacted in 1935. The Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, outlawing the use of injunctions in industrial disputes, changed the climate of industrial relations. Union membership increased from 2,857,000 in 1933 to 7,218,000 in 1937, to nearly 9,000,000 in 1940, to 15,000,000 in 1947.

Then in 1947, as had happened 27 years before, after World War I, we had a return to normalcy.

But this time there was a difference; instead of turning over to the private employer the power to determine the terms and conditions of employment, the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 laid upon the Federal Government the duty to use its powers to determine the terms and conditions of employment under the guise of some paramount public interest.

To enforce these Government injunctions, the Federal injunction was again revived and given statutory directives for immediate use by public officers against unions without a fair hearing. Accused unions and their members were to be hanged first and tried afterward.

At this point, I should like to point out that H. R. 4290 artfully offers to wipe out some of the antilabor provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, but at the same time would clothe the NLRB General Counsel with the most monstrous powers ever sought to be assigned to a

civilian officer in peacetime under our form of government.

H. R. 4290 says with a sly smirk that the mandatory use of injunctions on a Number One priority basis under certain circumstances is to be repealed; the use of injunctions is to be made discretionary with the NLRB General Counsel, who shall have the power to seek an injunction in any case in which there has been a charge of an unfair labor practice.

Mind you, the injunction may be obtained by the general counsel before any complaint has been issued by the NLRB, before there has been any hearing on the charge made by an interested party, before there has been any examination of the facts and evidence, before there has been any responsible determination by anyone aside from the NLRB general counsel. Again, we meet Judge Lynch, the law west of the Pecos, that proposes to "hang 'em first and try 'em afterward."

Mr. Chairman, when I consider this and other provisions of H. R. 4290, I feel that we are like children playing with dynamite caps. Believe me, there are dynamite caps strewn all through H. R. 4290 and in other amendments that are to be offered in the course of this debate.

H. R. 2032 is a sober, responsible, carefully considered measure intended and designed to reestablish and implement a national labor policy that helped to bring us out of the depression of the twenties and early thirties, that assisted in giving us as a Nation the productive strength and the greatest industrial production in the history of mankind, and that helped powerfully to win World War II.

We would be stronger now, Mr. Chairman, if we had not taken the wrong turning in 1947, blaming and seeking to punish labor for an inflation and a period of postwar industrial unrest in which wage earners, individually and in unions, were the principal victims.

If labor had been stronger in 1946, if the ranks of the unions had included substantially all the wage earners in the Nation, we would be stronger today, in terms of our internal economy, in the international economy, and in terms of national security. We would have today a healthier distribution and balance of our national income; farmers would be assured of a more stable market at fairer prices for their products; independent businessmen would be assured of a more stable market at fairer prices and profit margins; the specter of unemployment, underemployment, wage cutting, stretch-outs, speed-ups, and shake-outs of the aged would not today haunt the 46,000,000 nonagricultural wage earners in our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of this House to defeat legislation that, while paying lip service to union organization and collective bargaining contains deadly booby traps and land mines for the destruction of labor unions and the elimination of collective bargaining in the months and years ahead. By the pessimistic reckoning of some employers, we shall have a surplus of labor that will permit them to pick and choose on what organized labor calls the bad old "red apple for the foreman" basis of favoritism.

Here we get at the real issue in this debate. The issue is between those who really believe in the practice of collective bargaining between free unions and free employers and those who are afraid of the practice of collective bargaining between free unions and free employers and who prefer a pretense at collective bargaining in which labor, no longer free, is handicapped at every stage by the legal and procedural strait-jackets, and ankle-irons proposed in the Wood bill and other amendments to H. R. 2032.

A vote for H. R. 2032, without weakening amendments, is a vote for free unions and free employers; a vote against it or in favor of H. R. 4290 or similar perverting or weakening amendments is a vote against free unions today, against free employers tomorrow, against the practice of democracy in industry. And, not so far down the economic and political road, a vote against H. R. 2032 will amount to a vote against the practice of democracy in both the economic and political fields.

Let us make no mistake about this. Democracy is simpler than regimentation. The Wagner Act and H. R. 2032 are simpler than the Taft-Hartley Act and H. R. 4290. The Wagner Act and H. R. 2032 assert and implement the right to organize and to bargain collectively. That is the living rock on which any sound democratic labor policy must be based.

H. R. 2032 adds to the Wagner Act certain important substantive provisions providing for effective machinery in handling jurisdictional disputes and in declaring that secondary boycotts in support of jurisdictional disputes are unfair labor practices by unions.

In a free society a national labor policy need not and should not go far beyond the establishment of legal guaranty of the right to organize and to bargain collectively. It is fair and proper that an employer should be protected against being caught in the middle of a jurisdictional dispute brought about by no act or wish of his own, and that is provided in H. R. 2032.

One of the Taft-Hartley Act's principal errors was in attempting to take free unions and free employers a long way down the road toward complete "legislative determination of the terms and the conditions of private employment."

That is the issue, Mr. Chairman. We who ask for the adoption of H. R. 2032 are for the exercise of freedom and democracy in American industry; those who urge H. R. 4290 or additional regulatory amendments to H. R. 2032 are lending themselves, I have no doubt unconsciously in many instances, to a regimentation that would apply to wage earners today and, should their substitute be adopted and become the law of the land, to employers tomorrow.

It is obvious to me that such a national labor policy must recognize that collective bargaining is a two-way process. The Wagner Act recognized that fact. It put an end to a whole range of discriminatory practices that had been used by employers to discourage unionism, to break strikes, and to blacklist workers sympathetic to the cause of labor organization.

I realize that it has become fashionable in certain advertising agencies and public-relations outfits to picture the Wagner Act as one-sided. The products of these streamlined agencies were used by the National Association of Manufacturers and many corporations in the newspapers and magazines of this country, and this was fully developed in our subcommittee hearings. But a lie repeated a million times does not become the truth. No matter how many times they tried, big business in America could not disprove the fact that the Wagner Act was legislation designed to curb certain malpractices of industry and to make possible a basis for free collective bargaining. That and nothing more.

It has become equally fashionable to maintain that the Taft-Hartley Act restores a balance. But it does nothing of the sort. In fact, it only restores an earlier lack of balance and then adds repressive features against labor to aggravate still further that lack of balance.

Let me warn my distinguished colleagues as emphatically as I can, so long as the Taft-Hartley Act or its major provisions remain on the statute books, we can never have fundamentally cordial labor-management relations in these United States. So long as workers know the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act form an arsenal of legal weapons for the use either of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board or for any employer who wishes to use them, we cannot build good faith and a sound basis of industrial peace.

Our experience is clear. You do not get cooperation at the end of a gun. And the Taft-Hartley Act is just that. Full page ads in slick magazines, widely-circulated questionnaires full of loaded questions, the shrill hysteria of certain radio commentators—none of these can hide the one-sidedness of the Taft-Hartley Act from the workers who are its victims.

No section of the Taft-Hartley Act shows more openly its one-sidedness and its confusion than that section which calls upon elected union officers to sign non-Communist affidavits if they wish to use what few facilities of the National Labor Relations Board are still of importance to them.

My own experience, and the conversations I have had with many union leaders—in national offices and local offices—confirms the fact that the anti-Communist affidavit is of little use to anybody but the factories which produce the paper for the affidavits, and a few clerks at the Department of Labor whose jobs may depend on filing the affidavits into neat bundles. There should be something better for them to do.

I have always opposed Communists in labor unions and everywhere else. My union, the United Automobile Workers, has had considerable success in rooting out Communists from positions of leadership. Other unions in the Congress of Industrial Organizations have had similar successes in recent years. But the affidavits had nothing to do with this

cleansing of Communists from union positions.

There are Communists still holding some positions in some unions in this country. They did not sign the affidavits; they just stepped into other jobs and let their stooges take the elective posts and sign the affidavits. But the Communists were not swept from office in my union by affidavits, and they will not be swept out of their jobs in any other unions, until the members do the job.

The men who have been most successful in meeting the problem of communism in the American labor movement—who have the most experience—do not like the affidavit. President Murray and Secretary-Treasurer Carey of the CIO, President Reuther of the United Automobile Workers, and many others, are unanimously opposed to the affidavits. I think we should heed the words of these men, who might well be considered technical experts on the subject.

Some of the people who still support the Taft-Hartley Act acknowledge the correctness of labor's criticism of affidavits—but with typical refusal to face the facts, they seek to compound error upon error. Rather than repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and its affidavit section, they say: "Let's extend the affidavits, and make employers sign them too." Presumably those paper manufacturers and those Labor Department file clerks will welcome the extra work—but I think their services can be put to better use. I am willing to concede that the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers does not contain a single Communist—though I am often tempted to think that in their opposition to all progressive legislative proposals, they are acting just the way the Communists want them to act.

Even the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, headed by former Senator Ball, admitted that extension of affidavits would have no effect—except perhaps to fool workers into thinking the Taft-Hartley Act was being modified. And the committee pointed out that proposals for such an affidavit by employers might be tossed out by the United States Supreme Court as completely meaningless legislation.

The affidavit section was unnecessary legislation. So was the proposal that unions must file financial statements with the Federal Government. When the Taft-Hartley Act was first under consideration, its sponsors were told that almost every union files public financial statements. It was pointed out that there was nothing secret about those figures.

But Congress legislated on the subject anyway. The unions still publish their financial statements, and the Government files get further clogged with useless papers. Congress legislated against menaces that simply did not exist—both so far as the financial registration provision was concerned and on the whole subject of labor-management relations.

It is time that we heeded the call which they sounded at the voting booths last year. As a first step, we should repeal that evil legislation which has come to represent reactionary spirit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we pass H. R. 2032 to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act—as a first step toward enactment of the Fair Deal program which the people of the United States so earnestly demand.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, many years ago, some place, I heard the following philosophical bit:

> Don't trouble trouble if trouble doesn't trouble you.

Applying this pithy truth to the serious and important problem before the House today, I make these observations:

The Taft-Hartley Act is a trouble creator. It is a trouble stimulator. It sparks combustible matter.

Successful plant labor relations systems existing in many of our industrial enterprises throughout the country are of delicate, sensitive structure. They are the result of many fine adjustments created by employers and unions through the collective-bargaining process. Generally, in the employee relations history of these plants, there have been some rough periods; strong disagreement between managements and employees, strikes, misunderstanding of motives. Yet, out of these have grown fair and democratic rules of work and pay embodied in negotiated labor agreements. The scars have healed but are remembered.

Suddenly, from the outside, an all embracive statute, the Taft-Hartley law, superimposes a prefabricated labor relations policy tailored to much of the worst in labor relations and little of the best—and these successful plant systems find themselves modified by a heavy superstructure of detailed Federal law. What the original Wagner Act brought together the Taft-Hartley Act rips asunder.

What do we find?

First. Bootleg labor agreements where the employer and the union, having lived with the closed shop, continue to do so without benefit of the law.

Second. Technical rules for serving notices of varied description; employer to union, union to employer; 60-day notices, 30-day notices; notices to reopen a contract, notices to terminate a contract—all calendar-controlled and perilous if a day is missed.

Third. Legal strikes. Illegal strikes. Uncertainty as to where and when legality turns into illegality.

Fourth. The legalisms of "causing," "attempts to cause," "inducements," "attempts to induce," and so on until management and labor representatives turn into curbstone lawyers scanning a statute, long and involved, slated for years of Supreme Court interpretations.

And so on, can I enumerate the new and the novel our industry and our labor finds itself faced and concerned with.

The unnecessary irritations of the law become a factor in the relations between the parties. Sometimes, when misunderstandings arise over new terms and conditions of employment, the Taft-Hartley law provides the cover under which a bad-faith bargainer hides. He gets technical. The law gives him many technicalities for this unworthy purpose. Unions and employers can and do equally utilize this law for subterfuge purposes. Collective bargaining becomes subverted. The National Labor Relations Board becomes many times the recipient of this failure of the parties to meet their responsibilities. These failures are oft clothed in cases filed with the Board—and, when filed, the parties sit back and direct their energies at what amounts to lawsuits rather than collective bargaining. I cite you the Boeing Aircraft Co. case in Seattle, Wash., as an excellent example in point.

I submit that we should not trouble the waters of the fast and rocky stream of industrial labor relations. Let us clear the channel by removing the Taft-Hartley Act and bring back the Wagner Act. Let the Wagner Act be a mere greasing agent for the skids that direct each new ship into the collective-bargaining stream.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee have already been accurately informed on the high-handed methods which were employed in bringing this pending measure to the floor without consideration by the appropriate congressional committee. I must, however, in due fairness, pay tribute to the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in certain respects. In the first place, he made his position and his policy crystal clear. He did not engaged in any double talk or in any way try to mislead the members of the committee. He said, "So far as I am concerned, I am going to follow the instructions of the administration." He made it clear just where he stood and all of us admire this in any man, whether we agree with him or oppose him. And second, I must commend him on doing just what he said he was going to do. I think all of us share an admiration for those qualities in a man which lead to achievement of purpose.

The majority has taken the position that there was no need to consider this legislation in executive session or read the bill for amendment in committee. It has stated that the issues are clear and that the proposed measure merely reenacts the Wagner Act with certain amendments in the field of secondary strikes and boycotts and in jurisdictional disputes. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not entirely true. In section 107 of the bill, there is a so-called improvement of the original Wagner Act which gives legal sanction to the deduction from employees' pay without their consent of virtually any sums the unions might assess. The pending bill extends the automatic check-off to all membership obligations. This would include not only members' dues and initiation fees, no matter how discriminatory or how exorbitant, but also any assessments which the union might levy against the members generally or against particular

individuals. This would mean that unions, in many cases by a simple majority vote of those present at a union meeting, could assess all members substantial sums to be used for purposes to which many minority members might be opposed.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Would that cover a fine assessed by the union upon a member?

Mr. MORTON. As I understand the pending bill, it covers a fine assessed by the union on a member. For example, let us suppose that a certain union feels that it would be an act of charity and good will to contribute to the parent-teacher association of a nearby school in an underprivileged neighborhood to provide more adequate luncheons and health facilities for the children. Let us further suppose that 20 percent of the membership of this union belong to the Catholic faith and send their children to parochial schools which they support by voluntary donation. These men might justly feel that they would not want to contribute to a fund for the aid of children attending public schools. Yet if the majority so decided, they would have no choice. They would have to stand for the assessments or lose their jobs. It is a part of the American tradition that the majority must work its way. It is also a part of the American tradition that in so doing, the rights of the minority must be protected.

In the areas in which the majority admits that the Lesinski bill departs from the Wagner Act; namely, secondary strikes and jurisdictional disputes, we find a highly complex situation which should have been carefully explored in committee session. The fundamental fallacy of all the arguments in favor of secondary strikes is that they are inconsistent with the basic right of employees to make a free choice as to whether or not they will join a union and bargain collectively through their own representatives, free from coercion by employers. In the face of that right, secondary strikes and boycotts have no justification, for the secondary strike is not directed to persuading nonunion employees to join the union because of the benefits they can obtain by becoming members. It is directed against the employer of those employees.

Both under the original Wagner Act and under present law, the employer cannot take sides. He is forbidden to interfere with his employees in the exercise of their rights. He is forbidden to discriminate in regard to hire or tenure of employment, to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization. Many secondary strikes when used in the past were to force an employer to force his employees to join a union. Under either the Wagner Act or present law, that forces an employer to break the law.

This type of secondary strike and boycott might have had some justification in the era before labor's bill of rights was passed. Since that time a strike by union labor in order to compel their employer to cease dealing with a nonunion employer should have been an unfair labor practice, because the nonunion employer may not legally control or affect the union or nonunion status of his employees. The method by which the union should seek to unionize the employees is not the method of indirect coercion but the direct and democratic method of persuasion and selling itself by the advantages which it offers.

There is one form of secondary strike prohibited under present law which works an injustice to organized labor and it certainly should be corrected. The Taft-Hartley Act has a flat prohibition against the secondary boycott in all circumstances. This provision has been justly criticized on the ground that under it an employer whose men are on strike can farm out his work to another employer who may hire members of the same union. The present law should be amended so as to premit union members to refuse to work on contracts that are farmed out by employers whose employees are engaged in a legitimate strike.

In section 8 (b) (4) (A) of the present law, the owner of a small business is protected against enforced membership in a union organization or even in an employer organization. Most of the members of the committee are familiar with the Dock Street case which was to some degree responsible for the inclusion of the section above referred to in the present act. The Lesinski bill is silent on this subject. Just recently the International Barbers' Union, at its last convention, directed all union barbers to refuse to work at any shop unless the proprietor himself joined the union and paid dues, initiation fees, and special assessments, even though such proprietors had no right to participate in union affairs. Only after charges had been filed under the National Labor Relations Act did union officials agree to stop pressing this demand. If the Lesinski bill is adopted as presented, proprietors of barber shops as well as thousands of other small-business men would be at the mercy of such union demands.

Not content with diluting the prohibitions against secondary boycotts until they are almost meaningless, the authors of the Lesinski bill also seek to eliminate any effective enforcement machinery against such limited boycotts as they concede to be against public policy. Under the Taft-Hartley Act the General Counsel is empowered, if the investigation of the field staff shows a charge to be meritorious, to apply to the United States district courts for injunctive relief. The Lesinski bill deliberately omits any provision for temporary injunctive relief even in the most flagrant case of secondary boycott. The only remedy provided is that the parties aggrieved may file an unfair labor practice charge. The irony of this suggestion becomes clear when it is remembered that the Board is now so far behind in its work that it would take 18 months even in the simplest case between the date of the filing of the charge and the issuance of a cease and desist order. And even then a defiant union could continue to inflict severe economic damage upon innocent third parties and be completely immune from any financial liability, for the Lesinski bill, although providing for the judicial enforcement of Board orders, significantly eliminates any provision for the award of money damages.

The so-called prohibition against jurisdictional strikes which the Lesinski bill contains is just as empty. The Taft-Hartley Act in unequivocal terms made jurisdictional strikes an unfair labor practice and a cause of action for damages unless the employer involved in the jurisdictional dispute was violating a certificate or order of the Board by not assigning the disputed work to members of the striking union. The Lesinski bill not only contains no provision for suits for damages in order to deter jurisdictional strikes but does not make them even unfair labor practices. What it does is to provide that in the event of a jurisdictional strike the Labor Board may appoint an arbitrator. It is only after the arbitrator's award becomes final and binding that it becomes an unfair labor practice to continue a jurisdictional strike. In other words, the bill provides no method of obtaining any effective relief for at least 2 years after such a strike begins if the Board's present pace in keeping up to its docket may be accepted as a fair index.

The problems that I have covered are only a few of the many that we will encounter in trying to write a fair labor-management-relations law here on the floor of the House. I think an overwhelming majority of the people of this country agree that there was a need for the Wagner Act at the time of its passage. I think an equal majority will agree that there has been need for amendment in the years since 1935. The late President Roosevelt, when he signed the act, said that future amendments would in all probability prove necessary.

During the years that followed the passage of the Wagner Act, the union movement grew from childhood to manhood in this country and became the great agent for free collective bargaining. It has made a great contribution to our dynamic economy and to the living standard of the American people. As it grew and as our economy became more complex and more closely integrated, the need for remedial and clarifying legislation in the field of labor-management relations became apparent, but nothing was done by the Congress. This was so because the Wagner Act came to be regarded as a political sacred cow. The elections of 1946 made apparent a great public demand for legislation in the labor-management field. The Taft-Hartley Act was the result of that demand, and its severe impact, both real and emotional, in the labor movement can be, in large measure, attributed to the 15 years immediately preceding in which nothing was done. The present law in its application has demonstrated that it needs amending in several important respects. I favor the amendment of the present law in the light of present needs. I do not see why we should return to something that was passed nearly two decades ago in an entirely different set of circumstances and try to move forward from that point. The union movement in this country

today is strong, powerful, and vociferous. Management in this country today is also strong, powerful, and vociferous. Each of these giants is trying to get the best possible break for himself in the pending legislation. That is human nature. The task that is before us is difficult. We must first free ourselves of the acrimony and emotional overtones which accompany this fight between two giants. We must then proceed to write a bill here on the floor of the House which will protect the traditional American human rights and the welfare of the general public. I urge the members of the committee to proceed on this basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Chairman, I spoke and voted against the so-called Taft-Hartley bill when it was before this House for consideration during the Eightieth Congress. I felt it was a mistake at that time and the best proof that those of us who voted against the bill were right is the fact that a coalition is here with a bill which makes a gesture of amending this antilabor law instead of repealing it outright and enacting a new law in keeping with the desires of millions of organized and unorganized workers of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I was chairman of the Committee on Labor during the Hoover administration and was complimented by that administration for the humanitarian and constructive legislation reported and enacted into law at that time. Members of the House for years sought membership on the Labor Committee for the purpose of relieving the burdens of the toiling masses instead of reporting and helping to enact into law oppressive antilabor legislation. If you will read the House rules and manual pertaining to the powers and duties of committees you will find that every legislative committee of the House, such as Agriculture, Armed Services, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Post Office and Civil Service, and Veterans' Affairs, consider and favorably report legislation helpful to and in the interests of those who come under their jurisdiction, with the exception of the Committee on Education and Labor, which committee during recent years has been doing the very reverse.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my desire for amity between employers and employees. I have always deplored strikes, for the time and money lost through paralyzing strikes can never be regained. I do not condone acts of some labor leaders, and at the same time I am unalterably opposed to legislation oppressive and punitive to nearly 60,000,000 workers by reason of the acts of a few. I do not condone acts of unscrupulous lawyers who have been disbarred from the practice of their profession. But no sane person would attempt to condemn and punish the entire legal profession, from which the judicial branch of our Government is drawn, for those who disregard the ethics of that noble vocation. I do not condone acts of doctors who destroy human lives before they have seen the light of day, still I would be the last to attempt to condemn every member of that calling because some doctors have disgraced their profession.

Mr. Chairman, I deplore the effects of the Taft-Hartley law on the party founded by that great humanitarian Abraham Lincoln. Our democratic form of government calls for two strong parties numerically divided as nearly as possible. The 60,000,000 workers in this country, with the exception of a few, are God-fearing, law-abiding, home-loving patriotic people. The Taft-Hartley law in effect has been an indictment of these workers. Regardless of the intent of the proponents of the act, it has been generally accepted as an indictment and is strongly resented by them.

During the Revolutionary War, when the American Colonies were fighting for their independence, British Imperialists and Tories were demanding the extermination of what they termed the rebels. Edmund Burke, a great statesman and orator of that day, made a speech in the British Parliament urging conciliation in which he said:

> I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people. I cannot insult and ridicule the feelings of millions of my fellow creatures.

Burke made that statement concerning less than 4,000,000 people in the American Colonies; how much more true are his words when you multiply this to sixty million.

The Taft-Hartley law evidently cared nothing for the nearly 60,000,000 workers in this country, with the result that the law has driven millions of workers away from the Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, and reduced it to a hopeless minority.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill which is before us wisely makes no provision continuing the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations established by the Taft-Hartley Act. It wisely makes no provision for any committee similar in set-up and authority to the so-called watch dog committee.

The watch dog committee has for all practical purposes expired. I would not have it revived. This committee functioned long enough to demonstrate its ineptness and undesirability. It functioned long enough to demonstrate the manner in which quasi judicial functions can be interfered with by Members of Congress. In that way, and that way alone, it performed a useful function.

Public investigatory bodies, of course, may perform a valuable function, if they are constituted with due regard to the interests to be affected by their actions. Official commissions of one kind and another have performed and are performing laudable services for this Government. In this connection, it will be remembered that the President recommended to the Eightieth Congress the appointment of a temporary joint commission to inquire into the field of labor-management relations before laws on this subject were passed by that Congress.

In recognition of the correlative responsibilities involved, the President at that time in 1947 recommended that such commission be composed of Members of Congress, chosen by the presiding officers of the two bodies, and representatives of labor, management, and the public to be appointed by him. The Congress did not provide for such a commission. Instead, Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act, besides substantially doing away with the Wagner Act, did create an investigatory committee. This committee was authorized to study the field of labor relations and to make recommendations to Congress. The President had recommended that similar authority be reposed in a commission. As authorized however, the distinction between the joint committee and the President's recommended commission was fundamental. Neither labor, nor management, nor the public interests were directly represented on the joint committee. It was strictly congressional. It was not formed to obtain helpful tripartite assistance, as the Government had so often done in the past, or to share responsibilities in the complex, dynamic field of labor relations with leaders in this and allied fields. It walked alone. It is not strange that such a committee was ineffectual. It is not strange that it failed in obtaining cooperation. Listen, however, to this puzzled expression of the committee in its report issued in March 1948:

> Early in December 1947 we issued a public statement inviting unions, employers, employees, and the public to bring to our attention any case of an inequity created by the new law. We promised a complete investigation followed by recommended amendments should such an inequity be established. Our statement received wide publicity in the press, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and was extensively circulated. There was no response to our invitation.

The committee was surprised. I cannot say that I am.

The joint committee was authorized specifically to investigate, among other related subjects, the administration and operation of Federal laws relating to labor relations. It is the exercise of this authority which has earned it the name "watchdog." It is the manner in which this authority was exercised which runs counter to the independence of the executive and judicial branches of our Government.

Chancelor Kent considered the separation of powers between the three branches of our Government, as provided in our Constitution, a vital principle of freedom. I believe that such a division of powers is generally held to be vital to our system of government. It is the province of the United States Congress to pass laws. It is not the province of the Congress to execute laws, to expound laws, or to enforce laws. It is furthermore not appropriate for the Congress to inject its influence directly into the execution or the exposition of the laws.

The general counsel of the Board clearly stated before a committee of the Senate considering his confirmation that he felt it would be a privilege to consult the joint committee as to its interpretation of the various questions regarding the act before he took a position upon them. The close relations subsequently maintained between the members of the watchdog committee and the Government officials administering the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, certainly created a ready channel for the transmission of committee interpretations. Other evidence before the labor committees of this Congress show that communication between members of the respective bodies and their staffs was a constant occurrence. These communications, furthermore, involved personal conferences. Reports to Congress appraising the work of the Board, including the discussion of pending cases, were printed and circulated. There was no doubt as to the opinion of the committee on this law and its operation. No means of reaching the Board officials seemed to have been overlooked.

I believe that the fostering of police committees which offer the possibility of interference with the other branches of our Government is contrary to the effective organization of that Government. I believe that any committee which functions as the Taft-Hartley watchdog committee functioned imperils in basic aspects the liberty of our administrative and judicial officers.

H. R. 2032 does not provide for constant legislative scrutiny of the Labor Board activities. It does provide for cooperative efforts by the various interests of our country in improving the highly important functions of labor-dispute machinery. These efforts would be directed to the prevention of labor disputes, as well as to the formulation of policies and procedures most conducive to the peaceful settlement of disputes which do arise. Labor, management, and the public would express their views on these subjects through representation on labor advisory committees appointed by the Secretary of Labor. These advisory committees would assist the Secretary in administering the mediation and conciliation functions which would be restored to the Department of Labor under the bill. The creation of such committees would be a revival of a practice previously instituted by the Secretary of Labor. You will recall that the services of tripartite committees were most advantageously utilized by the Secretary of Labor in behalf of the Conciliation Service prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the conciliation and the mediation functions of the Government which may be exercised by the Federal Mediation Service are restricted in several respects. These restrictions would be removed from the reconstituted Conciliation Service under H. R. 2032. In the first place, the assistance of the Service would not be prohibited in connection with any particular class of cases. In the second place, it would be able to assist freely in the settlement of disputes involving existing agreements. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, Federal assistance may be offered in grievance cases under existing agreements only as a last resort and in exceptional cases. This appears to me to be a serious deficiency. A labor dispute is just as undesirable whether it arises under an existing contract or from conditions outside of the contract. It is just as costly, just as wasteful and disruptive of the interests of all concerned. The treatment of arbitration procedures under the Taft-Hartley Act is, in my opinion, not tenable. It is, of course, true that settlement by the parties concerned under a method agreed upon by the parties is the most desirable method for the settlement of any disagreement. But the parties should not be pushed into providing such a method. This is too much the same thing as compulsory arbitration. It is not in any sense free collective bargaining. Disputants in large numbers of cases should not be penalized by being deprived of governmental assistance in reconciling their differences. The Federal Government desires, it is my understanding, to foster industrial peace. The Federal Government desires to minimize industrial strife. But its assistance in attaining these aims is halfhearted under the Taft-Hartley Act. For disputes arising under existing agreements, the Federal Government may come in as a last resort, or in exceptional cases.

The state of desperation should not be a condition precedent to Government aid in labor disputes even under existing agreements. An effective conciliation service should assist the parties to a dispute in developing and perfecting arbitration techniques when necessary at any stage of disagreement. Such a service can also give invaluable aid to the parties to a dispute in framing basic issues to be decided by arbitration. These services can be utilized before an impasse had been reached, whether the dispute involves an interpretation of an existing contract or otherwise. These services could prevent an impasse with its undesirable psychological influence and time-consuming effects. You will recall that the United States Conciliation Service when it was located in the Department of Labor successfully performed functions relating to arbitration.

H. R. 2032 would remove the restraints on conciliation and mediation services imposed by the Taft-Hartley Act. Within the discretion of the Director of the Conciliation Service, the facilities of such Service could be made available in any labor dispute. This bill would also remove the impediments regarding the role of the Federal Government in arbitration. Assistance by the Service in connection with arbitration procedures would be authorized whether the terms of an existing agreement are an issue or not. The Service could once again function in the area of arbitration without serious hindrance. This area is a critical one. I believe that here the Federal Government can perform a valuable service in stimulating industrial peace. For this and other reasons I give H. R. 2032 my hearty support.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I make these remarks during this debate because the cancellation of construction of the great carrier by the Secretary of National Defense affects so much business and business management and labor that I think it should be brought up and considered during this debate.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ACTS WITHOUT AUTHORITY

In my remarks I am going to include the editorial written by Mr. David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Star for Monday, April 25, 1949. This article deals with the devastating blow that has been dealt to the United States Navy by the autocratic method used in abolishing the construction of the large aircraft carrier.

May I remind the leadership of this Congress and all of the Members that by law—by statute—enacted in Congress this carrier was authorized. In other words, there is a Federal statute on the law books which states the United States Navy can go ahead and build this great ship. Now, I ask you, is there any law which gives the Secretary of Defense, or any person, the authority to nullify an act of Congress and thereby show the world disrespect of this great legislative body? Is this a dictatorship or is this a Government of the people conducted by their representatives in Congress. Are we selling out our freedom from within or is this Nation going to remain a democracy? This act of the Secretary of Defense shows most clearly that he has failed—and utterly failed—to consider this problem from all viewpoints. He has injured most severely the morale of the great United States Navy—the same Navy that defeated Japan in the Pacific; the same Navy to which the great Japanese Empire surrendered. He has dealt a devastating blow to the national security of the United States.

How about the representatives of the people? The Secretary of Defense by this single-handed act of dictatorship has cast disrespect upon the leadership of this Congress. I am just a woman, but a woman interested in national defense, a woman interested in our form of government. If this Congress is to hold the respect of the people of this Nation—yes, if the freedom of this country is to survive, I appeal to this leadership to stand up and fight. Join my voice and let the Secretary of Defense know that Congress is still in operation and that Congress is still the legislative body of this Nation that determines policy, and that Congress will not stand idly by and permit any person in Government or out of Government to violate the authority of the people's representatives assembled.

My fellow Members, this carrier was authorized by the President of the United States. The President of the United States told the Navy he approved of this ship and he wanted it constructed. Has he made any statement or taken any responsibility in this momentous autocratic decision of the Secretary of Defense? That is a question I should like to have answered.

My time is up. I appeal to you to read the article by Mr. David Lawrence, included here in my remarks, and I appeal

to every Member here, if he believes in the respect of Congress and in constitutional government, to rise up and inform the Secretary of Defense he has made a grave error and that it is the intention of Congress to correct that error.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of April 25, 1949]

JOHNSON SEEN DEFYING CONGRESS BY HALTING WORK ON NEW CARRIER—UNIFICATION THREATENED BY LETTING TWO SERVICES VETO PROJECT OF THIRD

(By David Lawrence)

Unification of the armed services—long sought by Congress and the American people as a desirable objective—has just been dealt a devastating blow.

In defiance of the express authority of Congress, the new Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, has permitted two of the armed services to pair off against the other.

Instead of confining the Joint Chiefs of Staffs to the definition of functions and missions agreed upon in the famous Key West document on joint operations, the Secretary last week asked the head of each service to sit in judgment on what tools the other services shall have to carry out their missions. It is a plain violation of the spirit of the Key West agreement.

This is what the decision to halt work on the super aircraft carrier means. Twice Congress had the matter up and authorized the Navy to allocate its tonnage according to its own best judgment. There is no power in any existing law which authorizes either the President or the Secretary of Defense to ignore the authorizations made by Congress for the armed services.

Yet last week Secretary Johnson, in effect, put before the Joint Chiefs of Staff the question of whether the will of Congress should be superseded. The Joint Chiefs of Staff met and decided to put its views in writing. Three letters were delivered to Secretary Johnson on Saturday morning last and within half an hour the decision of the Secretary was given to the press—even before the head of the Navy, Admiral Louis Denfeld, knew about Mr. Johnson's decision.

NO CONSULTATIONS HELD

Worse than this, at no time since Mr. Johnson became Secretary of Defense has he consulted the Chief of Naval Operations about the matter nor has he given the Secretary of the Navy, John L. Sullivan, a chance to talk with him about it.

This merely confirms what has been suspected ever since Mr. Johnson took office—namely, that he came with preconceived judgments and did not approach the problems with an open mind. No man now should be given the powers which have just been asked of Congress for the Secretary of Defense after such a flagrant example of arbitrariness has been revealed.

It is not the halting of work on the aircraft carrier which is so important. It is the basic principle which is at stake.

For if, by a stroke of the pen, the Secretary of Defense can ignore the statutes of Congress, he can overnight ask for a vote from the Joint Chiefs of Staff on whether the Marine Corps shall be absorbed in the Army and whether the naval air arm should be absorbed in the land-based air forces and these steps really could mean the weakening of the defense of the United States.

This is not unification but disintegration. The blow that has been struck at the morale of the Navy will be felt throughout that service. All eyes had been fixed on the Secretary of Defense to see how he would handle the carrier issue. He was, however, not even graceful in his disposal of a difficult problem. He did not give either the Secretary of the Navy or the Chief of Naval Operations the courtesy of a personal conference.

SULLIVAN'S SITUATION

It is difficult to see how Secretary Sullivan can continue in office or how any self-respecting man can accept office as his successor if he is to learn of important decisions affecting his department by reading about them in the press. It is difficult to see how the Joint Chiefs of Staff is to function effectively hereafter without a specific definition of its duties. For otherwise, the Navy head, for instance, will be called on to decide how many tanks the Ground Forces shall have and whether B-36's shall or shall not be built in quantity and other details of the weapons desired by other armed services with which the Navy is not familiar.

The vote by the JCS was two to one—with the Army and Air Force chiefs voting against the Navy. Neither the Army chief nor Air Force chief had a top command in the Pacific or saw a large-scale naval war. The carrier problem is a technical matter in which the Navy is expert. It won the war against Japan largely by naval carrier action.

The only solution is to let each armed service specialize in its own way, each helping the other on joint missions as worked out already in the famous Key West agreement which was unanimous. This can be accomplished only if, after a lump sum is decided on as a total for all services, the right of each service to use to the best of its ability the money allotted to it will not be impaired. If the Navy's appropriation had been cut in half recently, it still would have preferred to develop the new aircraft carrier because it believes that weapon is vital to naval operations and to antisubmarine warfare. It is a sad and tragic story which should be fully aired in Congress so that the American people will know the whole truth.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, on July 5, 1935, the Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act of 1935—the so-called Wagner Act. The stated purpose of that act was to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes. The act contained provisions for the organization of employees into labor organizations for the purpose of collective bargaining, defined unfair labor practices of employers, established a National Labor Relations Board with investigatory and enforcement powers, and provided for judicial review of orders of the Board.

The Wagner Act continued in effect until the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947—the so-called Taft-Hartley Act—which was passed by the Congress on June 23, 1947, and became effective on August 22, 1947.

The stated purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act was to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The Taft-Hartley Act enlarged the National Labor Relations Board to five members, provided that employees may refrain from labor activities, defined unfair labor practices of labor organizations, modified procedures of the Board, established an independent agency—the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service—to assist in the settlement of labor disputes, provided machinery to function in connection with strikes imperiling the national health or safety, contained provisions for suits by or against labor organizations and provisions for boycott and other unlawful combinations, prohibited labor organizations from making political contributions, and created a Joint Congressional Committee on Labor-Management to study the subject.

On January 5, 1949, the President in his message on the State of the Union stated that the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed and added:

> The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited. The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented. Without endangering our democratic freedoms, means should be provided for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.
>
> The Department of Labor should be rebuilt and strengthened and those units properly belonging within that Department should be placed in it.

The present Taft-Hartley Labor Act was conceived in a punitive spirit. It is not fit for piecemeal correction. It is an offense to our democratic processes. The present labor law has not reduced strikes. It has merely loaded the legal scales against unions, it has exposed their treasuries to harassing suits. It has had only a limited effect on reducing Communist influence in unions. The non-Communist affidavit sections of the act that have been introduced into our law are a dangerous menace and a definite threat to our liberties.

The proposed bill (H. R. 2032) will protect every legitimate public interest. It would continue to protect employers against minor but generally irritating union practices. And it would rid the country of the anti-union spirit of Taft-Hartley.

The proposed bill would abolish the specific legislative sanctions for injunctions to deal with so-called national paralysis strikes. It would eliminate Taft-Hartley provisions abolishing the closed shop, limiting the union shop and absolutely banning all secondary boycotts. It would restore to unions the right to bargain freely for a full closed shop and would repeal the Taft-Hartley provisions expressly inviting State laws against union security more drastic even than Taft-Hartley.

Organized labor is clearly subject to appropriate regulation by Congress. But Taft-Hartley is not the base from which to start.

The Taft-Hartley bill is intertwined, interdependent, one section upon another, and interrelated. So that to try to amend Taft-Hartley without full repeal would lead to a very confusing, contradictory, and extra legal labor law, almost inconceivably unworkable.

President Philip Murray, of the CIO, branded the original Wood bill as being more viciously repressive of labor's basic

rights than the Taft-Hartley Act itself. The gentleman from Georgia, Congressman WOOD, has now revised his original bill purportedly to meet some of the objections of labor to the original draft. An analysis of the revised bill, however, demonstrates that the present Wood bill, H. R. 4290, still reenacts most of the substantive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act and in several important particulars strengthens Taft-Hartley provisions to make them even more objectionable to labor. No one who reads the Wood bill, H. R. 4290, will be deceived by the language which purports to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. This statement in the bill is mere sophistry. The Wood bill is the Taft-Hartley Act plus additional anti-labor prohibitions. The few concessions in the Wood bill purporting to eliminate or change Taft-Hartley provisions are inconsequential and insubstantial. They constitute window dressing which will deceive no one.

Any vote that may be cast for the Wood bill is a vote against labor and against the public interest.

The following is an analysis of the salient provisions of the revised Wood bill, H. R. 4290:

First. The discretionary right of the general counsel of the NLRB to obtain injunctions is retained and in fact enlarged by permitting injunctions to issue merely upon a filing of charges that an unfair labor practice has been committed and without investigation, proof, or hearings. This would extend rather than curtail government-by-injunction which is conceded to be one of the outstanding abuses of the Taft-Hartley Act. Under this provision the Norris-LaGuardia Act would become a virtual nullity.

Second. The disenfranchisement of economic strikers imposed by the Taft-Hartley Act, and conceded even by Senator TAFT to be unjust, is substantially retained in the Wood bill through the device of permitting economic strikers to vote only if they are not replaced 90 days or more before the election. Obviously, employers by delaying petitioning for election until 90 days after the hiring of strikebreakers can still effectively prevent economic strikers from voting in Labor Board elections.

Third. The Taft-Hartley Act language which has been interpreted to prevent peaceful picketing by labor unions is retained by the provision of the Wood bill prohibiting restraint or coercion by unions.

Fourth. The ban on secondary boycotts provided in Taft-Hartley is modified only to a very limited extent. The modification permits a union, if its collective agreement so provides, to refuse to work on struck goods where the striking employees are members of the same union. Most justifiable economic boycotts are, therefore, still prohibited. The provision of the Taft-Hartley Act making it mandatory for the general counsel to seek injunctions in secondary-boycott cases is modified to give the general counsel discretion whether to seek such injunctions. But as pointed out above, this discretionary right is extended to permit injunctions to be issued merely upon the filing of charges alleging the union has committed this or any other type of alleged unfair labor practice.

Fifth. Unions continue to be subject to unwarranted lawsuits in the Federal courts, as permitted by Taft-Hartley.

Sixth. The check-off provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are made more restrictive by making it necessary to procure new check-off authorization cards each year, thus burdening unions with this additional unnecessary administrative burden not now required under Taft-Hartley which permits automatically renewable check-off cards.

Seventh. While the Wood bill purports to eliminate the Taft-Hartley requirement for a union-shop authorization election it provides that 30 percent of the employees can petition for an election to prohibit a union shop and retains most of the other complicated Taft-Hartley election procedures, including employer election petitions and decertification provisions.

Eighth. The Taft-Hartley Act permits discharge for nonmembership in a union under a union-shop agreement only if the employee was discharged from the union because of failure to pay dues. The Wood bill, while permitting discharge also for expulsion because of Communist affiliation or participating in a strike in violation of a contract, would not permit discharge for expulsion from the union because of antiunion activity, embezzlement of union funds, or other recognized intolerable practices.

Ninth. The Taft-Hartley provision making more restrictive State laws against union security superior to the Federal law is retained.

Tenth. The Wood bill would make illegal closed or union-shop agreements entered into prior to the Taft-Hartley Act and continuing for a term of years. Such agreements are prevalent in industries enjoying stable collective-bargaining relationships and their validity was recognized and preserved by Taft-Hartley. The Wood bill in this as in other respects goes beyond Taft-Hartley. Furthermore, the general prohibitions against all closed-shop contracts is retained although it is declared not to be an unfair labor practice for an employer "merely to notify a union of opportunities for employment." This vague language does not realistically meet the need of legalizing the hiring hall and other similar forms of union security.

Eleventh. Taft-Hartley restrictions on collective bargaining in relation to welfare funds are preserved.

Twelfth. The Government's power to to seek injunctions in national emergency strikes is broadened by providing for the issuance of such injunctions even before the appointment of an emergency board rather than as in Taft-Hartley after such appointment.

Thirteenth. The agency definition of the Taft-Hartley Act under which international and local unions have been held responsible for acts not actually authorized or ratified is retained.

Fourteenth. The Taft-Hartley restriction on political contributions and expenditures by labor unions is retained.

Fifteenth. The so-called free-speech provision of Taft-Hartley which goes far beyond the legitimate protection of the constitutional right of employers to free speech is retained.

Sixteenth. The Wood bill, like the Taft-Hartley, would preserve the general counsel of the NLRB as a labor czar by continuing the present separation of powers as between the Board and the general counsel first introduced in the Taft-Hartley Act. This is contrary to the unanimous expert opinion that the NLRB, like all other similar administrative agencies should be restored to the procedures prescribed in the Administrative Procedures Act.

Seventeenth. Like Taft-Hartley, the Wood bill provides for a separate Conciliation Service rather than for the return of the Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor where it properly belongs.

Eighteenth. Numerous other provisions of the Wood bill are Taft-Hartley provisions like the individual-grievance clause, the exclusion of supervisors from the protection of the act, the jurisdictional-dispute section which, in fact, is made more unworkable by limiting the opportunities for parties to settle their own disputes and the non-Communist-affidavit requirement which is enlarged to require such affidavits by employers as well as unions.

Now no amount of apology or any number of alibis will only serve to further confuse the membership of this body. You have a clear mandate to remedy an abominable situation. I call upon you to exercise that right.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY].

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, this Congress has a responsibility to the people which it intends to fulfill. In the elections of last November 2, the people were given a clear choice in the important matter of labor legislation. One major party, in its platform, endorsed the Taft-Hartley Act and called for its continuance. The other major party, in its platform, came out unconditionally for the repeal of this particular statute. The issue was also clearly drawn in the campaign addresses of the candidates of the respective parties.

On November 3, when the votes were counted, the preferences of the people became known to the Nation and the world. The American people had elected the Presidential candidate who opposed the Taft-Hartley Act. At the same time the electorate sent into oblivion members of the Eightieth Congress who endorsed the Taft-Hartley Act, choosing in their stead legislators pledged to repeal.

The facts were placed clearly before the American people in the campaign of 1948. The issue was sharply drawn. Then, on election day, the people spoke. We in this House are representatives of the people. They have given us their mandate. It is a clear and undeniable mandate. We must carry it out or else stand convicted of a breach of faith.

I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the Members of this House, as sincere believers in the democratic process, feel as I do that the Congress desires to carry out this mandate of the people. And I am equally sure that many

members of the Republican Party, although their platform favored retention of the Taft-Hartley Act, will vote in favor of the bill now before us. For the people's mandate expressed on November 2 last is a mandate to the Eighty-first Congress as a whole—to all Members of the House and Senate alike. It cannot be denied, however, that the obligation is particularly emphatic in the case of the Democratic Members of the present Congress. Let it never be forgotten by any Member of this House in this month of April 1949, that we solemnly pledged, by the mere act of running for election under the Democratic standard, that we would uphold and carry into execution the provisions of the platform. The provision of that platform which binds us and concerns us now is the provision calling for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been a malicious law. It has done grave harm in the 2 years that it has been on the books. Its chief injury has been in the breeding of bitter resentment among the tens of millions of patriotic citizens who are classified as wage earners. The working people of the Nation, who sacrificed so much and contributed so tremendously to our victory in the recent war, feel that they have been rewarded for their sacrifices by being slapped in the face. The working people are convinced that the Taft-Hartley Act, while ostensibly the creation of Mr. TAFT, Mr. Hartley, and like-minded legislators of the late and unlamented Eightieth Congress, was actually drafted by the gang of high-priced corporation lawyers sent to Washington in 1947 by the National Association of Manufacturers and its allies.

The Taft-Hartley Act is regarded by the workers of the Nation as a millstone around their necks. Instead of having the opportunity to strive for the redress of grievances and for a somewhat fairer share of the wealth they produce, the workers of this country, thanks to the Taft-Hartley Act, find that the scales are weighted all the more heavily in favor of the employers.

This country has come a long, long way since the time of Judge Gary and others of similar convictions. No longer is it believed beneficial to the Nation to have men and women working for a miserable pittance. No matter where one goes, whether it be among industrialists or wage earners, economists, or lawmakers, there is general agreement that the United States can be economically strong and can continue to progress only if purchasing power among the millions is kept at a high level. We can produce so much of every conceivable commodity that it is imperative that we make all the people of our Nation, not merely the wealthy and the well-to-do, capable of becoming customers for these commodities.

Experience has shown that we can look to only one institution to bring increased purchasing power to the tens of millions of average working people of our Nation. That institution is the trade-union. Because the trade-union performs this most essential function in our economy, labor organization deserves to be protected and encouraged. Everyone benefits when there is adequate purchasing power in the possession of the people. The farmer benefits because the worker with money in his pocket can buy an adequate supply of what the farmer produces. The merchants benefit in a similar manner. The doctor and the dentist, the manufacturer of shoes, and the manufacturer of automobiles, indeed every person or company with something to sell benefits when mass purchasing power is kept at a high level.

This is so elementary that it ought not to be necessary to take time to spell it out. Unfortunately, there are people who overlook this basic factor. The authors of the Taft-Hartley Act overlooked it. As a result of the vicious law which they wrote and which the Eightieth Congress enacted over a Presidential veto, the purchasing power in the hands of the masses of our people is today inadequate to maintain prosperity in America. As everyone knows, the sales of shoes, hats, dresses, household furnishings, and a thousand and one other useful articles in the stores of our Nation have fallen off sharply. It is no secret that hundreds of factories around the country have this year closed down for varying periods, sometimes 1 week, sometimes 10 weeks or more, because the little people of the Nation just do not have the money to buy all the shoes and all the refrigerators and all the other commodities which we can produce and must sell.

This is the great harm which the Taft-Hartley Act has caused. If there had been no Taft-Hartley Act, the trade-unions of this country would have been able to go forward during the past 2 years. They would have been able to win added and necessary purchasing power for the working people of the Nation—the largest segment of people in our country at the present time. Instead, the unions have been compelled to fight hard and often at tremendous expense, as, for example, in the case of the typographical workers in Chicago, merely to keep from being driven back.

Well, the Taft-Hartley Act must go. That is the decision of the American people. That must also be, and I am confident that it will be, the decision of this House as well as of the Senate. The Taft-Hartley Act is a very bad law and we shall rid ourselves of it.

What is to take its place?

The House now has before it an excellent bill. This bill is H. R. 2032, reported favorably after careful consideration by the Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 2032, which is usually referred to as the Lesinski bill, is now before us, and I strongly urge its passage by the House as it is written.

The Lesinski bill does three necessary and very constructive things. First, it eliminates the one-sided, brutal Taft-Hartley Act. Secondly, it reenacts the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. Thirdly, it modifies and strengthens the statute of 1935 so as to make the proposed new law, which will be known when passed as the National Labor Relations Act of 1949, a model labor-management relations statute.

The Wall Street Journal, the Journal of Commerce, and the publications of the National Association of Manufacturers have unleashed a barrage of misrepresentation in regard to the Lesinski bill. At this late date, their false charges are clearly recognized for what they are. No intelligent Member of this House is going to be swayed by irresponsible and mendacious allegations against a splendid bill which emanate from such sources as the NAM and the journalistic mouthpieces of big business.

H. R. 2032 is a highly meritorious bill in that it does away with the monstrous Taft-Hartley Act and reenacts the Wagner Act. This is what the country wants and needs. Under the Lesinski bill wage earners will once again have the right to organize and bargain collectively without interference from their employers. Collective bargaining is the only sound means of attaining fair working conditions and fair wages.

The Wagner Act was a fair and constructive statute. It did not attempt to dictate and control every act and decision of the employers or the workers. It sought only to bring about an approach to equality of bargaining between workers and employers. This it achieved. And it achieved equality of bargaining, so desirable in the public interest, with a minimum—an absolute minimum—of interference.

The Taft-Hartley Act is a club in perpetual motion against the workers and their organizations, which they formed in order to protect themselves and further their economic interests. The Taft-Hartley Act has a thousand and one prohibitions and hobbling and interfering features. "Don't do that, don't do this," says the Taft-Hartley Act. "You can't do that. Oh, no, that's prohibited. As for this, that is absolutely forbidden. No, you daren't do that." And so on and so forth. Governmental interference carried to the *n*th degree—and all this, oddly enough, at the behest of an association—the NAM—and a political party—the Republican Party—which have long cried out loudly against this self-same evil.

The Wagner Act affords a refreshing contrast to the Taft-Hartley Act. In the Wagner Act there was the absolute minimum amount of interference which history had shown to be essential. The Wagner Act simply says:

First. Employers must not use unfair labor practices that interfere with the freedom of workers to organize.

Second. Employers are obliged to bargain with the representatives of their employees.

The Lesinski bill reenacts the Wagner Act. It also provides for the return to the safeguards of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed in 1932. It was passed—by a Republican Congress, incidentally—because of the evil of the use of injunctions in labor-management relations.

Now, I have said that the Lesinski bill amends the Wagner Act in certain respects. There are several amendments and, in my judgment, as in the judgment of the Committee on Education and Labor, these are wholly constructive. I shall refer to these amendments a little later and explain just what they are.

The Lesinski bill is the type of bill which deserves to have the support of fair-minded legislators, of Members of this House who believe in justice not only for the employer but also for the man and woman who must work in order to live.

The Lesinski bill embodies the principles of justice in the realm of labor relations. It encourages free collective bargaining. It is designed to afford an opportunity to workers to secure a fair return for their labor. It requires the employer to play the game according to rules that are fair and square.

The Taft-Hartley Act, in sharp contrast, merely has given lip service to these principles of fair play. Actually, it was written to encourage antilabor employers to fight the organization of labor and to undermine genuine collective bargaining by ranging the power of government on the side of the antilabor employer.

Until the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, the policy of this Nation for 15 years had been the encouragement of free collective bargaining. This policy had served us well. It was a major factor in pulling the Nation out of the worst economic depression in history.

It is necessary that the Federal Government shall play a part in the effectuation of the policy of encouraging genuine collective bargaining. This is dictated by the realities of modern economic life. However, while playing its necessary part, it is imperative, if we are not to flout the basic principles of our democracy, that the amount of Government interference and coercion should be at a minimum.

These requirements of a satisfactory labor-relations law are fulfilled completely in the Lesinski bill, now before us.

Since 1935, when the Wagner Act went into effect, experience has demonstrated the need for certain changes. The President has pointed this out at various times in his messages and reports to the Congress. H. R. 2032, therefore, in addition to repealing the Taft-Hartley Act and reenacting the Wagner Act, embodies the amendments necessary to bring the Wagner Act up to date.

Let us go through the bill to see just what it contains. This is a very important piece of legislation. It is, therefore, essential that we should take the time necessary to analyze and understand it thoroughly.

There are four titles. Title I, section 101, provides for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Section 102 reenacts the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 as it existed prior to Taft-Hartley.

Section 103 of title I continues the National Labor Relations Board as a five-member tribunal. Provision is also made for the continuation of the present panel system. It has been found that the work of the Board is accomplished more expeditiously with five members than under the three-member set-up established by the Wagner Act. Another change is an increase in the salaries of Board members from $12,000 a year to $17,500 a year.

Title I, section 106, deals with the subject of unjustifiable secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes. The Lesinski bill has been written in accordance with the principle that only those employer or union practices which prevent or interfere with free collective bargaining should be prohibited. Disputes between two or more unions over which one has jurisdiction over the performance of a particular work task do not promote free collective bargaining. If an employer is guilty of an unfair practice when he deals with a union other than the one chosen by the majority of employees, it should likewise be an unfair practice for a union to compel him to do this.

Therefore, the Lesinski bill provides certain amendments. These amendments make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to cause or attempt to cause employees to engage in a secondary boycott or a strike for the following purposes: First, to compel an employer to bargain with one union if another has been certified by the Labor Relations Board, or if the employer is required by an order of the Board to bargain with another union, or if the employer already has a contract with another union and a question of representation cannot appropriately be raised under the act; second, to compel an employer to assign certain work tasks contrary to an award issued by the Labor Relations Board under the proposed amendment to section 9 (d) of the Wagner Act.

There is no blanket prohibition of all types of secondary boycotts in the Lesinski bill, as there is in the Taft-Hartley Act. This provision in the Taft-Hartley Act has been used ruthlessly to prevent unions from using legitimate measures in the defense of wage standards and conditions of work.

The Lesinski bill makes provision for the appointment of arbitrators in jurisdictional-dispute cases. Either the Board or an arbitrator named by the Board may make an award in a jurisdictional dispute.

Section 107 of title I amends section 8 (3) of the Wagner Act to permit employers to make collective-bargaining agreements providing for the closed shop or other forms of union security or for the check-off of union dues and assessments, notwithstanding the provisions of State laws. The purpose of this provision is to eliminate the subjection of employers and unions in interstate industries to conflicting rules.

Section 107 will remove the illegality of closed-shop agreements introduced by the obnoxious Taft-Hartley Act. The stabilizing influence of the closed shop in the printing industry, in garment manufacture, in construction, and various other industries, is well established. Section 107 has the effect of enabling employers and unions once again to bargain freely and to agree upon such union-security provisions as they find mutually desirable.

In this connection it is appropriate to refer to a statement made by Mr. Paul M. Geary, executive vice president, National Electrical Contractors Association, when he appeared before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate. Mr. Geary said:

> As employers, we feel that legislation outlawing the closed shop impairs the employer's right of contract. If an employer prefers to deal only with a group of men who have sold him their worth and responsibility, should he not be permitted to do so? To ban the closed shop is merely to restrict further the employer's right to bargain and to contract with persons of his own choice.

Title II of the Lesinski bill deals with mediation and arbitration. This title provides for the return of the United States Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor, which is where it obviously belongs. The bill emphasizes the function of the Conciliation Service as an aid to collective bargaining and industrial peace and by stressing the need for the Service to assist the parties in settling their differences voluntarily through arbitration as well as through the aid of mediation and conciliation.

Title III of the Lesinski bill deals with situations which arise when work stoppages occur in vital industries which affect the public interest. Wherever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he is to issue a proclamation and appoint an emergency board.

This board must make its report to the President within 25 days after the issuance of the proclamation. The report will include both the board's findings and its recommendations. The report will be transmitted to both parties to the dispute and it will also be made public.

A total cooling-off period of 30 days is provided—25 days during which the emergency board is making its investigation and report and five additional days after the report has been submitted.

As is well known, the force of public opinion is a mighty force indeed. The procedure established under the Lesinski bill makes it possible to secure from a group of impartial and respected experts findings and recommendations upon the basis of which an informed opinion can be reached. By directing the emergency board to make recommendations as well as findings, both of which are to be made public, this national emergency provision of the Lesinski bill invokes the tremendous power of public opinion as a stimulus to agreement between the paries.

Title IV is the last title of the Lesinski bill. It is entitled "Miscellaneous Provisions."

Section 401 restores in full force and effect the prohibitions in the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Clayton Act against the issuance of labor injunctions.

Section 402 deals with political contributions. It restores the political-contributions provision of the Corrupt Practices Act as it existed prior to the Taft-Hartley Act. It is no more than right that this correction should be made. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, labor organizations were singled out as the one

type of volutary unincorporated association whose political activities should be restricted. This ban was not applied to voluntary organizations representing farmers, veterans, businessmen, or other groups.

H. R. 2032, which is now before the House, is identical with S. 249, the Thomas bill, which has been reported favorably to the other Chamber. H. R. 2032 has been endorsed by the Nation's foremost authorities on labor-management relations. For example, Dr. William M. Leiserson has spoken highly of this bill. Dr. Leiserson is impartial. He knows whereof he speaks. He was formerly a member of the National Labor Relations Board and chairman of the National Mediation Board. This is what he said:

I think this is the kind of bill that we need at this time.

The Lesinski bill is a bill which carries out the mandate of the American people. It carries out the recommendations of the President in his message on the state of the Union, delivered last January 5. The need for this bill has been made clear in the evidence presented by witnesses who testified before the committee when the Lesinski bill was under consideration there.

The sooner there is a restoration of harmony and mutual respect between the parties in the realm of labor-management relations, the better it will be for all Americans—for employers as well as workers, for farmers, for businessmen, for merchants and, indeed, for all who participate in our economy. The sincere practice of collective bargaining, with both labor and employers satisfied that the Federal law treats both sides equitably, will enable our country to go forward once again.

The Lesinski bill is fair to labor, fair to employers, and fair to the country as a whole. It is an excellent bill in every respect. Its prompt enactment would be clearly in the national interest.

For all of these reasons, I earnestly call upon the Members of this House to brush aside the last-minute substitute proposals of those who wish to nullify the popular will and I strongly urge that the Members proceed as promptly as possible to the passage of the constructive, honest, and fair Lesinski bill.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, on the roll-call vote today on the rule, under misapprehension and misinformation, I voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show I intended to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will stand. The vote itself cannot be changed at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I sought and obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a chart. I have been informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $300 to print this chart. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the additional cost it may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include addresses and newspaper material.

Mr. BURKE asked and was granted permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include certain material mentioned.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLEVENGER (at the request of Mr. JENKINS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. THOMPSON until April 27, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 27, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

563. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter by the Secretary of the Army recommending enactment of a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for certain adjustments on the promotion list of the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

564. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for the requirements of Federal aeronautical agencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

565. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for baseboard radiation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2514. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3181. A bill to provide for more effective conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3717. A bill to repeal the act of July 24, 1946, relating to the Swan Island Animal Quarantine Station; without amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2906. A bill to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4081. A bill to amend section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to permit the delivery of excess peanuts to agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture and to define the term "cooperator" with respect to price supports for peanuts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Louis Esposito; without amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter; with amendments (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3458. A bill for the relief of Celeste Iris Maeda; without amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub; without amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3497. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; without amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 4346. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the contruction of public school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 4347. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit certain former citizens of the United States to regain their citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4348. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (by request):

H. R. 4349. A bill to provide that unclaimed animals lawfully impounded in the District of Columbia be made available to educational, scientific, and governmental institutions licensed under this act shall be made available for scientific purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4350. A bill to name the twin highway bridges over the Potomac River in the District of Columbia the "George Washington Memorial Bridge" and the "Thomas Jefferson Memorial Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 4351. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to convey to the port of Cascade Locks, Oreg., certain lands for municipal or port purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4352. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS (by request):

H. R. 4353. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4354. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4355. A bill to provide for lump-sum payments to certain Reserve officers assigned to duty as naval air navigators or naval air observers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 4356. A bill to make it an offense against the United States to use the flag of the United States for advertising purposes, or to mutilate, defile, or cast contempt upon the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 4357. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure by contract in the open market and in the manner common among businessmen, the services of engineers, engineering associations, or organizations needed or required in connection with the acquisition or construction of public works; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 4358. A bill to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4359. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to extend assistance to veterans with certain service-connected disability, involving the loss of both lower extremities, in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 4360. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4361. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize regular appropriations for the construction of rural local roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 4362. A bill providing for the conveyance to the Franciscan Fathers of California approximately 40 acres of land located on the Hunter Liggett Military Reservation, Monterey County, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to empower Congress to regulate the use and ownership of trade-marks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. Res. 194. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Mary Leimgruber; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. Res. 195. Resolution for the relief of Doris Batey Cox; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to appropriations for the propagation of fish in Arizona; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate the full $250,000 recommended by the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and that thereafter a minimum of at least $250,000 be provided annually in the appropriations to the Department of the Interior until the current conditions have been corrected; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the work of Dr. Ralph Johnson Bunche in bringing about a peaceful settlement of the Arabian-Israeli dispute; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Joint Resolutions 7 and 21, to enact legislation relating to the disposal of temporary housing; and memorializing the Federal Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Federal Government in relation to reimbursing the State of California and the reconstruction of flood-control works on the Sacramento River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law S. 529, which provides for the establishment of a Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 1549, which provides aid and assistance for veterans in the settlement of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to making a full and thorough investigation of the possibilities of obtaining for the State of Colorado a liquid-fuel plant or plants; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to require price support of eggs at the top grade, including frozen and shell eggs, with deductions for under-grade eggs, and to eliminate the present practice of supporting only the price of dry eggs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary legislation to return the grounds and buildings of the Fort Des Moines Army post to the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose all legislation designed to establish a single Federal Reserve force and to retain intact the National Guard as it is now organized, thus reserving to the States the controls provided by the Constitution and insuring that the National Guard will be at the disposal of the State in time of peace; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging prevention of eviction of veterans and their families from Devencrest in the town of Ayer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging enactment of legislation to provide compensation for employees of the Division of Employment Security of Massachusetts for certain services rendered by them to the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, protesting the action of Gen. Lucius D. Clay in commuting the sentence of Ilse Koch and requesting the proper authorities in Washington to have the matter reviewed in order that the ends of justice may be served; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to direct the United States mint to strike off a commemorative silver half dollar in commemoration of a century of railroad operation out of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the rights and privileges of veterans of World War II under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to excise taxes on furs, and to amend H. R. 1211 to provide suitable import quotas on furs to protect the domestic producer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to condemning the report of the Committee on Civilian Components recommending the establishment of a single Federal Reserve or militia as unconstitutional, and to resist this effort to centralize the military power in Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation effecting the disclosure to the tax administrators of the

States taxing cigarettes by shippers thereof in non-cigarette-taxing States of shipments of cigarettes to other than State-licensed distributors in cigarette-taxing States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation effecting the disclosure to the tax administrators of the States taxing cigarettes by shippers thereof in non-cigarette-taxing States of shipments of cigarettes to other than State-licensed distributors in cigarette-taxing States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide funds for carrying out and performing items 1 to 13, inclusive, of the interim survey report for the Arkansas River and tributaries of the lower Arkansas River watershed made by the Soil Conservation Service in conjunction with the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to keeping the National Guard of the United States intact; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and to make appropriations for the development of a harbor suitable and sufficient for ocean shipping at the mouth of the Rogue River on the Oregon coast in Curry County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each shipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging appropriation of Federal funds to assist in Ketchikan road project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting legislation to give the people of Alaska the powers of initiative and referendum and recall; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that Senate bill 533, Eighty-first Congress, not be enacted into law; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that H. R. 976 and 2031 or other suitable legislation be enacted to stimulate the exploration, development, mining, production, and conservation of strategic and critical minerals and metals within the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting an appropriation of funds for the study, control, and eradication of fruitfly pests; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the enactment of S. 566, a bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate amendments of title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary," to take effect upon the admission of Hawaii to statehood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4363. A bill for the relief of Nora Toma Trabilsy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 4364. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clarence F. Moore, John Robert Lusk 3d, J. R. Lusk, Sr., Gertrude Elizabeth Lusk, Mrs. Willie Pruitt, and Mrs. Billie John Bickle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4365. A bill for the relief of Fe'R. Dumaguing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 4366. A bill for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 4367. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Jose Joao Santo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4368. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Jose Casimero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4369. A bill for the relief of Eugene F. Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4370. A bill for the relief of May Hosken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4371. A bill for the relief of Shiro Takemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Bernadette Jones Marchbanks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Ray. G. Schneyer and Dorothy J. Schneyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4374. A bill for the relief of Filipe Guerreiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Michele Belardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 4376. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna M. D. Broughton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4377. A bill for the relief of Adelchi Colecchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 4378. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wisniewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 4379. A bill for the relief of Lacey C. Zapf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 4380. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

655. By Mr. ASPINALL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memoralizing the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation concerning the granting of loans to members of the fur-farming industry in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

656. By Mr. HESELTON: Petition of the City Council of the City of Pittsfield, favoring the establishment of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

657. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging prevention of eviction of veterans and their families from Devencrest in the town of Ayer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

658. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of legislation to provide compensation for employees of the Division of Employment Security of Massachusetts for certain services rendered by them to the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

659. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the Arizona House of Representatives, relating to the propagation of fish; to the Committee on Appropriations.

660. Also, memorial of the mayor and City Council of the city of Mesa, Ariz., memorializing the Congress to pass, and the President to approve, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

661. By Mr. NELSON: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, opposing all legislation designed to establish a single Federal Reserve force, and to retain the National Guard as it is now organized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

662. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Dr. Harvey L. Zwald and citizens of Eldred, McKean County, Pa., urging repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

663. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Fifth Congressional District Conference of Townsend Clubs, Sanford, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means

664. Also petition of Mrs. Fannie E. Thomas and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that we may have the mind and mood of the Master as daily we seek to find a just and righteous solution to the problems of human relationships.

We pray that Thou wilt take our groping and faltering spirits and transform them into centers of light and power in the building of a finer social order. Kindle within us a keener sense of responsibility for the welfare and happiness of all mankind.

May we have the faith and the courage to believe in the coming of the Kingdom of God. May our vision of its splendor be so glorious that we shall make its consummation the goal of all our aspirations and endeavors.

Hear us in the name of the blessed King. Amen.